

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
SECOND ANNUAL MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSOCIATION  
OF  
AMERICAN COLLEGES  
HELD AT  
CHICAGO, ILL.  
January 20-22, 1916

---

Edited by  
R. Watson Cooper  
Secretary of the Association

---

Published by the Association  
Office of the Secretary  
Fayette, Iowa  
February, March, April and November, 1916

Application For Entry at Post Office in Fayette, Iowa,  
as Second Class of Mail Matter, according to  
Act of Congress, March 3, 1879.

## PRAYER

---

*Offered at the Opening of the Association.*

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for all the blessings Thou hast given to our nation and to us. We thank Thee for the high place Thou hast permitted this nation among the nations of the earth, and we pray that Thy blessing may so rest upon all our national life that this nation may fulfill its function and accomplish Thy divine purpose and will. We thank Thee for the place the colleges of America have had in the development of our national character. May Thy blessing rest upon all the success of this convention, that we may have wisdom in the high and sacred work committed to us, and that in all our work we may have assurance of fellowship and partnership with the Divine.

Bless the students from whom we are separated, and bless their homes scattered far and wide in every state in this nation and among the other nations of the world; and grant that from our colleges may go influences to lift up this nation, and all the nations of the earth, into the perfection of manhood and womanhood that Thou hast intended for the human race.

In the name of Jesus Christ: Amen.







## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Sphere and Possibilities of the		
Association.....	President Kelly.....	21-29
Sphere and Possibilities of the		
Association.....	President McClelland.....	30-33
Campaign of Christian Education.....	Secretary Nicholson.....	34-55
"    "    "    "    "    "	Dr. Burton .....	56-60
The Efficient College.....	Dr. French .....	60-85
"    "    "    "    "    "	Dean Cole .....	85-95
Catholic Colleges.....	Dr. Spaulding.....	95-96
Committee on Higher		
Educational Statistics.....	President Cowling.....	96-102
Committee on Higher		
Educational Statistics.....	Dean Holgate .....	102-104
The Junior College.....	Commissioner Claxton .....	104-112
"    "    "    "    "    "	President Nollen .....	112-116
Municipal Universities, and the		
Colleges.....	President Dabney.....	116-129
Municipal Universities and the		
Colleges.....	President Kerfoot .....	129-134
Vocational Training and		
College Course.....	President Sharpless .....	134-147
Vocational Training and		
College Course.....	Dean Angell .....	148-154
Vocational Training and		
College Course.....	President Millis .....	154-156
Academic Freedom and Tenure.....	President Welch.....	157-171
"    "    "    "    "    "	Professor Weatherley.....	171-179
"    "    "    "    "    "	President Meiklejohn .....	179-187
The Academic Budget.....	President Godfrey.....	188-202



# Association of American Colleges

## SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

Chicago, January 20, 21, 22, 1916

### PROGRAM OF MEETINGS

THURSDAY EVENING, JANUARY 20

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS: *The Sphere and Possibilities of the Association*—Robert Lincoln Kelly, LL. D., President of Earlham College.

Discussion: led by Thomas McClelland, LL. D., President of Knox College.

*The Proposed Campaign for Christian Education*—Thomas Nicholson, LL. D., Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Chairman of Campaign Committee of Council of Church Boards.

Discussion: led by Ernest Dewitt Burton, D. D., University of Chicago.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 21

9:30 A. M.

### COLLEGE STANDARDIZATION.

*The Efficient College* (continuation of a report submitted at the annual meeting in 1915)—Calvin H. French, D. D., Associate Secretary College Board of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America.

Discussion: led by Charles Nelson Cole, PH. D., Dean of Oberlin College of Arts and Sciences.

Partial Report of the Joint Committee on the Standardization of American Colleges—Donald J. Cowling, PH. D., President Carleton College, Member of the Joint Committee, representing the Association of American Colleges.

Discussion: led by Thomas Franklin Holgate, LL. D., Dean of Northwestern University.

## ASSOCIATION OF

FRIDAY AFTERNOON

2:00 P. M.

BUSINESS SESSION.

## SPECIAL TYPES OF COLLEGE:

*The Junior College*—Philander P. Claxton, PH. D., the  
United States Commissioner of Education.

Discussion: led by John S. Nollen, LL. D., President of  
Lake Forest College.

*Lessons from the Municipal Universities for the American  
Colleges*—Charles W. Dabney, LL. D., The University  
of Cincinnati.

Discussion: led by Samuel F. Kerfoot, D. D., President of  
Hamline University.

---

FRIDAY EVENING

8:00 P. M.

## THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM

*Relation of the college Course to Vocational Training*—

Isaac Sharpless, LL. D., President of Haverford Col-  
lege.

James Rowland Angel, A. M., Dean of the Faculty of  
Arts, Literature and Science, The University of  
Chicago.

Elmer Burritt Bryan, LL. D., President of Colgate  
University.

Discussion: led by William A. Millis, LL. D., President of  
Hanover College.

---

SATURDAY, JANUARY 22

9:30 A. M.

## THE COLLEGE TEACHER.

*Academic Freedom*—Herbert Welch, LL. D., President of  
Ohio Wesleyan University.

Discussion: led by U. G. Weatherly, PH. D., Indiana University, Member of the Committee on Academic Freedom of the Association of American College Professors.

*Tenure of Office*—Henry S. Pritchett, PH. D., President Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Discussion: led by Alexander Meiklejohn, LL. D., President of Amherst College.

*The Academic Budget*—Hollis Godfrey, Sc. D., President of Drexel Institute.

Discussion: led by S. C. Capen, PH. D., Specialist in Higher Education of the United States Bureau of Education.

---

The program was carried out as announced with the following exceptions:

President Bryan by reason of a serious business conflict, Dr. Pritchett for a similar reason, and Dr. Capen on account of sickness, failed to meet their appointment upon the program. On learning of Dr. Pritchett's necessary absence, President Kelly requested President Welch to extend his address so as to include both ACADEMIC FREEDOM and TENURE OF OFFICE.

All addresses, reports and leading discussions are printed in the pages that follow.



MINUTES OF THE ASSOCIATION  
MEETING IN HOTEL SHERMAN, CHICAGO  
JANUARY, 20, 21, 22, 1916

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20

The first regular meeting of the organized Association of American Colleges, which is here officially recorded as the Second Annual Meeting, the preliminary gathering for organization, January, 1915, having been adopted and recorded as the First Annual Meeting, came to order promptly at 8 o'clock, Thursday evening, January 20, 1916. President Robert L. Kelly in the chair. President J. Campbell White of the College of Wooster led in prayer. The program was carried out as announced, the speakers being President Kelly, President McClelland, Dr. Nicholson, and Dr. Burton.

The matter of a special separate publication of Dr. Nicholson's Address was referred to the Executive Committee.

Appointment of Committees: Committee on Time and Place of Meeting,—Presidents Hanley, Crossfield, McMillan, Harms, and Professor Brackett; Committee on Nomination of Officers,—Presidents Plantz, Main, Martin, Small, and Dean Fetterman.

The Association adjourned.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 21—MORNING SESSION

The Association met at 9:30 o'clock, and the proceedings were opened with prayer by President McMichael.

Resolutions introduced by President Cairns were read by the secretary and referred to a special committee,—Dr. Dinwiddie, Miss Purington, and President Boone.

The program was then carried out as printed. Speakers: Dr. French, Dean Cole, President Cowling, and Dean Holgate.

Matter of amending the title of Dr. French's report on the "Efficient College" and of special publication of the report for distribution among the colleges was deferred until the Saturday morning session.

At the suggestion of President Harker the Association adopted the following resolution: "That this Association hereby expresses it as their judgment that all reports from all the colleges to the Committee of Higher Educational Statistics of the Bureau of Education at Washington should make formal affidavit as to the accuracy of the report through the President or other chief executive officer."

Auditing Committee appointed: Presidents Peirce, Johnson, and Howe.

The Association adjourned.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

The Association met at 2 P. M.

The printed statement of the Treasurer was presented and referred to the Auditing Committee, who asked permission to postpone report thereon till the Saturday morning session.

The secretary presented a report of the doings of the Executive Committee for the year and requested that consideration be given to three matters: the deliverance of the Executive Committee on the policy of the Association, authority to enrol President and Librarian of each institution in the Association as subscribers to the official Bulletin, and the classification of membership as members and associate members. Suggestions of secretary were referred to a special committee: Presidents Taylor and King and Dr. Schumacher.

Report of Committee on Time and Place of Meeting, presented by President Hanley, chairman, recommended, "that the next meeting of the Association be held in Chicago some time in January 1917, and that the exact date and place of meeting be left to the Executive Committee." Report adopted.

Mr. Charles D. Hurrey of the International Young Men's Christian Association, representing the Committee on Foreign Relations of that Association, was introduced and addressed the Association of American Colleges on the desirability of encouraging the presence of foreign students in our colleges and recommended the granting of special scholarships to such students. Dr. Kato of Japan, alumnus of Kalamazoo college and of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, seconded the suggestion of Mr. Hurrey. The Association passed the following resolution: "We have heard with interest the proposal of the Committee on Foreign Relations among Foreign Students regarding scholarships for foreign students in American colleges, and we commend the recommendation to the favorable consideration of the members of the Association of American Colleges."

The afternoon program was then carried out as printed, the speakers being Commissioner Claxton, President Nollen, President Dabney and President Kerfoot.

Special Committee on Resolutions of President Cairns reported as follows: "The resolutions of President Cairns referred to your committee for consideration and report reads as follows:

"RESOLUTION I.

Resolved: That any four-year College preparatory, or four year high school may enter its graduate on certificate in any of the colleges belonging to the Association of American Colleges, provided the said graduate has made passing grade in the school which certifies him.

Provided, also, that this college entrance shall be on probation for six weeks, at which time if the standing of the aforesaid student does not prove to be satisfactory, the college authorities may drop him from their rolls.

"RESOLUTION II.

Resolved: That any college that is a member of the Association of American Colleges may transfer its student at the completion of the Freshman or Sophomore year, giving credits for advanced standing in a certificate to enter the

Sophomore or Junior year of any other college which is a member of the Association of American Colleges.

Provided, also, that this college entrance shall be on probation for six weeks, at which time if the standing of the aforesaid student does not prove to be satisfactory, the college authorities may drop him from their rolls.

Provided, also, as colleges have different entrance requirements, nothing in these resolutions is to be construed as obviating strict conformity to the entrance, requirements of the college preferred for entrance.

"RESOLUTION III.

Resolved: That these resolutions be forwarded to the National Commissioner of Education, and that he be asked to embody them in a public document similar to the one announcing the formation of the Association of American Colleges; also, that this document may contain a full list of all the colleges connected with this Association, and that this public document be sent to every high school and college preparatory school within the United States, that the Association may be given the publicity it deserves, and the tide of young students may be turned into the colleges that are members of this Association."

Your committee recommends that these resolutions be not adopted, on the following grounds:

FIRST, their adoption would bring this Association directly into conflict with the standards and the methods of administration of college requirements as accepted generally by colleges and college associations throughout the country;

SECOND, the attempt to enforce upon colleges of this Association regulations such as are involved in these resolutions would be an assumption of authority distinctly out of harmony with the spirit and purpose of the Association."

The report was adopted.

President Martin, chairman of the Nomination Committee reported the following officers for the ensuing year:

For President, Henry C. King, of Oberlin College

Vice-President, William A. Webb, of Randolph Macon Woman's College.

Secretary-Treasurer, R. Watson Cooper, Upper Iowa University.

Members of Executive Committee:

Abram W. Harris, of Northwestern University.

Robert L. Kelly, of Earlham College.

The report was adopted, and the officers elected for the ensuing year.

The Association adjourned to 8 P. M.

#### EVENING SESSION

The Association convened at eight o'clock. President King of Oberlin College was introduced as the new President of the Association.

With the exception of President Bryan who was absent, the evening session was then conducted according to program, the speakers being President Sharpless, Dean Angel, and President Millis.

At the close of the discussion the Committee on Recommendations of the Secretary reported:

FIRST, that this Association formally approves the deliverance of the Executive Committee on the working policy of the Association, that this should be understood as a policy of *Inclusiveness and Interhelpfulness rather than of Exclusiveness*;

SECOND, that the following additional by-law be adopted, to the effect that the secretary of this Association is authorized to mail all official Bulletins to the Libraries and the Presidents of all institutions which are members of this Association and have paid their annual dues, as subscribers to the same.

THIRD, in response to a further question to this committee, we would recommend that you instruct the secretary to make out and keep separate lists of the two classes of membership of this Association as provided in the constitution and by-laws."



Submitted by President Taylor as Chairman of the committee and adopted by the Association.

The matter of charge for extra copies of the Proceedings was referred to the Executive Committee.

The Association adjourned.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 22,—CLOSING SESSION

The Association convened at 9:30 o'clock, and was opened with prayer by Dr. Stonewall Anderson.

It was ordered that the minutes be carefully edited by the secretary, reduced to a memorandum of proceedings and printed.

The Auditing committee, through President Peirce, chairman, reported:

"The committee appointed to audit the Treasurer's accounts report that they have performed this duty, finding the expenditures supported by proper vouchers and the balance certified as on deposit in bank."

The report was adopted.

The matter of printing and distributing Dr. French's Report on "The Efficient College" was then taken from the table as special order of the day and was disposed of as follows: That copies of Dr. French's Report be printed in sufficient numbers to supply five copies to each member of the Association, copies to be mailed by the secretary, and that such additional copies as may be asked for by any institution be supplied at five cents a copy; and that the title page shall indicate that this is the report of Dr. French upon "The Efficient College, as read before the Association of American Colleges", and the report be distributed in this form.

The Association by vote expressed its "hearty approval of the method pursued by Dr. French in his work upon this paper" and ordered the appointment of a committee of the Association to work with the committee of the Council of Church Boards represented by Dr. French, "to continue in the work, to revise the report, and present their further

findings next year, either as a final report or as another step toward a final report."

President Kelly asked the privilege of leaving the appointment of this committee to the incoming President of the Association.

It was ordered that in regard to editing and printing the Proceedings of the Association the same method be pursued as in the preceeding year.

With the exception of Dr. Pritchett and Dr. Capen, the program was then carried out as announced, speakers being,—President Welch, Professor Weatherley, President Meiklejohn and President Godfrey.

At the close of the discussion, the Association ordered the appointment of a Standing Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of office. The appointment of the committee was left to the incoming President.

The Association adjourned *sine die* at 12:30 o'clock time for adjournment having been previously set at that hour by vote of the Association.

(Signed

R. WATSON COOPER,

Secretary.

---

### CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS.

THE PURPOSE of the Association shall be the consideration of questions relating to the promotion of higher education in all its forms, in the independent and denominational colleges in the United States which shall become members of this Association, and the discussion and prosecution of such questions and plans as may tend to make more efficient the institutions included in the membership of the Association.

NAME: The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges."

MEMBERSHIP: All colleges which conform to the definition of a minimum college given in the By-Laws may become members of this Association. Colleges which do not



conform to this definition may become associate members without vote.

**REPRESENTATION:** Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in such meeting of the Association through the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution, or other accredited representative. Any officer being a member of the faculty or Board of Trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, or any officer of a Church Board co-operating with such an institution shall be entitled to all the privileges of a representative excepting the right to vote. Each institution recognized as a member of the Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

**OFFICERS:** The Association shall elect a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary and Treasurer, who shall be charged with the duties usually connected with their respective offices and who shall serve one year, or until their successors are duly elected. The Association shall at the same time elect two others, who with the three officers above named shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Association. The election of officers shall be by ballot. The term of office shall be for one year, beginning at the close of the annual meeting, and the President, Vice-President and the two members of the Executive Committee shall not be eligible to succeed themselves. The President or Chief Executive Officer of any institution connected with the Association may be elected to office. The President of the Association shall be *ex-officio* Chairman of the Executive Committee.

**MEETINGS:** At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the Executive Committee, provided that four weeks' notice of same be given each institution connected with the Association. Representatives of eleven members of the Association shall be necessary to form quorum for the transaction of business.

**BY-LAWS:** The Association may enact by-laws for its own government not inconsistent with the provisions of this constitution.

**VACANCIES:** The Executive Committee is authorized to fill vacancies *ad interim* in the offices of the Association.

**AMENDMENTS:** Amendments to the foregoing constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two (2) seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members then present.

#### BY-LAWS.

**No. 1.**

In order to be eligible to membership in this Association, institutions shall require fourteen units for admission to the Freshman class and shall also require 120 semester hours for graduation; but the latter requirement may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Association.

**No 2.**

The annual dues shall be five dollars per member.

**No. 3.**

The secretary of this Association is authorized to mail all official Bulletins to the Libraries and Presidents of all institutions which are members of this Association and have paid their annual dues as lawful subscribers to the same.

## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

### PRESIDENT:

Henry Churchill King, Oberlin, Ohio.

### VICE-PRESIDENT:

William A. Webb, Lynchburg, Virginia.

### SECRETARY-TREASURER:

R. Watson Cooper, Fayette, Iowa.

### ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Abram Harris, Evanston, Illinois

Robert L. Kelly, Richmond, Indiana.

### REPRESENTATIVE ON COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION- AL STATISTICS:

Donald J. Cowling, Northfield, Minnesota.

### COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE EFFICIENCY:

Charles Nelson Cole, Oberlin, Ohio.

Donald J. Cowling, Northfield, Minnesota.

Thomas Franklin Holgate, Evanston, Illinois.

### COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE OF OFFICE:

Robert L. Kelly, Richmond, Indiana.

W. F. Slocum, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Lyman P. Powell, Geneva, New York.

Herbert Welch, Delaware, Ohio.

Alexander Meiklejohn, Amherst, Massachusetts.

---

## MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

Akron, Municipal University of ..... Akron, Ohio

Albion College ..... Albion, Michigan

Alfred University ..... Alfred, New York

Allegheny College ..... Meadville, Pennsylvania

Alma College ..... Alma, Michigan

Baker University ..... Baldwin, Kansas

Baldwin-Wallace College ..... Berea, Ohio

Bates College ..... Lewiston, Maine

Baylor University ..... Waco, Texas  
 Bellevue College ..... Bellevue, Nebraska  
 Beloit College ..... Beloit, Wisconsin  
 Berea College ..... Berea, Kentucky  
 Bethany College ..... Bethany, West Virginia  
 Bible College of Missouri ..... Columbia, Missouri  
 Blackburn College ..... Carlinville, Illinois  
 Bridgewater College ..... Bridgewater, Virginia  
 Brown University ..... Providence, Rhode Island  
 Butler College ..... Indianapolis, Indiana

Campbell College ..... Holton, Kansas  
 Campion College ..... Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin  
 Carleton College ..... Northfield, Minnesota  
 Carnegie Institute of Technology ..... Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
 Carroll College ..... Waukesha, Wisconsin  
 Carthage College ..... Carthage, Illinois  
 Central College ..... Pella, Iowa  
 Central Wesleyan College ..... Warrenton, Missouri  
 Chattanooga, University of ..... Chattanooga, Tennessee  
 Cincinnati, University of ..... Cincinnati, Ohio  
 Clark College ..... Worcester, Massachusetts  
 Coe College ..... Cedar Rapids, Iowa  
 Colorado College ..... Colorado Springs, Colorado  
 Connecticut College for Women ..... New London, Connecticut  
 Converse College ..... Spartansburg, South Carolina  
 Cooper College ..... Sterling, Kansas  
 Cornell College ..... Mount Vernon, Iowa  
 Creighton University ..... Omaha, Nebraska

Dakota Wesleyan University ..... Mitchell, South Dakota  
 Davidson College ..... Davidson, North Carolina  
 Defiance College ..... Defiance, Ohio  
 Denison University ..... Granville, Ohio  
 Denver, University of ..... University Park, Colorado  
 De Pauw University ..... Greencastle, Indiana  
 Des Moines College ..... Des Moines, Iowa  
 Dickinson College ..... Carlisle, Pennsylvania  
 Drake University ..... Des Moines, Iowa  
 Drexel Institute ..... Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Dubuque College ..... Dubuque, Iowa  
 Dubuque College ..... Dubuque, Iowa

Earlham College ..... Richmond, Indiana  
 Eastern College ..... Manassas, Virginia  
 Ellsworth College ..... Iowa Falls, Iowa

Elmira College..... Elmira, New York  
 Elon College..... Elon College, North Carolina  
 Emporia, College of..... Emporia, Kansas  
 Eureka College..... Eureka, Illinois

Fairmount College ..... Wichita, Kansas  
 Fargo College..... Fargo, North Dakota  
 Fisk University..... Nashville, Tennessee  
 Forest Park University..... St. Louis, Missouri  
 Franklin College..... Franklin, Indiana  
 Franklin College..... New Athens, Ohio

Geneseo Collegiate Institute..... Geneseo, Illinois  
 Geneva College..... Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania  
 Georgetown College ..... Georgetown, Kentucky  
 George Washington University..... Washington, D. C.  
 Goucher College ..... Baltimore, Maryland  
 Graceland College..... Lamoni, Iowa  
 Greenville College ..... Greenville, Illinois  
 Grinnell College..... Grinnell, Iowa  
 Guilford College..... Guilford College, North Carolina

Hamline University..... St. Paul, Minnesota  
 Hanover College ..... Hanover, Indiana  
 Hastings College..... Hastings, Nebraska  
 Haverford College ..... Haverford, Pennsylvania  
 Hedding College ..... Abingdon, Illinois  
 Hendrix College ..... Conway, Arkansas  
 Henry Kendall College..... Tulsa, Oklahoma  
 Highland Park College..... Des Moines, Iowa  
 Hillsdale College..... Hillsdale, Michigan  
 Hiram College ..... Hiram, Ohio  
 Hobart College..... Geneva, New York  
 Hope College..... Holland, Michigan  
 Huron College..... Huron, South Dakota

Idaho, College of..... Caldwell, Idaho  
 Illinois College ..... Jacksonville, Illinois  
 Illinois Wesleyan University..... Bloomington, Illinois  
 Illinois Woman's College..... Jacksonville, Illinois  
 Iowa Wesleyan College..... Mt. Pleasant, Iowa

James Milliken University..... Decatur, Illinois  
 Jamestown College..... Jamestown, North Dakota  
 John B. Stetson University..... Deland, Florida

Kalamazoo College ..... Kalamazoo, Michigan  
 Kansas Wesleyan University ..... Salina, Kansas  
 Kenyon College ..... Gambier, Ohio  
 Knox College ..... Galesburg, Illinois

Lafayette College ..... Easton, Pennsylvania  
 Lake Erie College ..... Painesville, Ohio  
 Lake Forest College ..... Lake Forest, Illinois  
 Lawrence College ..... Appleton, Wisconsin  
 Leander Clark College ..... Toledo, Iowa  
 Lebanon University ..... Lebanon, Ohio  
 Lebanon-Valley College ..... Annville, Pennsylvania  
 Lehigh University ..... South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania  
 Leland Stanford Jr. University ..... Stanford University, California  
 Lenox College ..... Hopkinton, Iowa  
 Lincoln College ..... Lincoln, Illinois  
 Lincoln University ..... Lincoln University, Pennsylvania  
 Lombard College ..... Galesburg, Illinois  
 Louisiana College ..... Pineville, Louisiana  
 Louisville, University of ..... Louisville, Kentucky  
 Luther College ..... Decorah, Iowa  
 McKendree College ..... Lebanon, Illinois  
 McMinnville College ..... McMinnville, Oregon  
 Macalester College ..... St. Paul, Minnesota  
 Maryville College ..... Maryville, Tennessee  
 Midland College ..... Atchison, Kansas  
 Milton College ..... Milton, Wisconsin  
 Milwaukee-Downer College ..... Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
 Missouri Valley College ..... Marshall, Missouri  
 Missouri Wesleyan College ..... Cameron, Missouri  
 Monmouth College ..... Monmouth, Illinois  
 Morgan College ..... Baltimore, Maryland  
 Morningside College ..... Sioux City, Iowa  
 Mount Union College ..... Alliance, Ohio  
 Mt. Holyoke College ..... South Hadley, Massachusetts  
 Muhlenberg College ..... Allentown, Pennsylvania  
 Muskingum College ..... New Concord, Ohio

Nebraska Wesleyan University ..... University Place, Nebraska  
 Northwestern College ..... Naperville, Illinois  
 Northwestern University ..... Evanston, Illinois  
 Notre Dame, University of ..... Notre Dame, Indiana

Oberlin College ..... Oberlin, Ohio  
 Occidental College ..... Los Angeles, California  
 Ohio Wesleyan University ..... Delaware, Ohio



Oriental University..... Washington, District Columbia  
 Ottawa University..... Ottawa, Kansas  
 Otterbein University..... Westerville, Ohio

Palmer College..... Albany, Missouri  
 Park College..... Parkville, Missouri  
 Parsons College..... Fairfield, Iowa  
 Penn College..... Oskaloosa, Iowa  
 Pennsylvania College..... Gettysburg, Pennsylvania  
 Pennsylvania, University of..... Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Pittsburgh, University of..... Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
 Pomona College..... Claremont, California  
 Potomac University..... Washington, District Columbia

Randolph-Macon College..... Ashland, Virginia  
 Randolph-Macon Woman's College..... Lynchburg, Virginia  
 Rice Institute..... Houston, Texas  
 Richmond College..... Richmond, Virginia  
 Rio Grande College..... Rio Grande, Ohio  
 Ripon College..... Ripon, Wisconsin  
 Roanoke College..... Salem, Virginia  
 Rockford College..... Rockford, Illinois  
 Rochester, University of..... Rochester, New York  
 Rose Polytechnic Institute..... Terre Haute, Indiana  
 Rutgers College..... New Brunswick, New Jersey

Salem College..... Winston-Salem, North Carolina  
 Simpson College..... Indianola, Iowa  
 South, University of the..... Sewanee, Tennessee  
 Southern California, University of..... Los Angeles, California  
 Southwestern College..... Winfield, Kansas  
 Southwestern University..... Georgetown, Texas  
 Southwestern Presbyterian University..... Clarksville, Tennessee  
 St. Stephens College..... Annandale, New York  
 St. Olaf College..... Northfield, Minnesota  
 Smith College..... Northampton, Massachusetts  
 Shurtleff College..... Alton, Illinois  
 Swarthmore College..... Swarthmore, Pennsylvania

Taylor University..... Upland, Indiana  
 Temple University..... Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Throop College of Technology..... Pasadena, California  
 Transylvania University..... Lexington, Kentucky  
 Trinity College..... Durham, North Carolina  
 Trinity University..... Waxahatchie, Texas  
 Tufts College..... Tufts College, Massachusetts



Tusculum College.....	Greeneville, Tennessee
Union College.....	Schnectady, New York
Upper Iowa University.....	Fayette, Iowa
Ursinus College.....	Collegeville, Pennsylvania
Vassar College.....	Poughkeepsie, New York
Washington and Jefferson College.....	Washington, Pennsylvania
Washington and Lee University.....	Lexington, Virginia
Waynesburg College.....	Waynesburg, Pennsylvania
Wellesley College.....	Wellesley, Massachusetts
Wells College.....	Aurora, New York
Wesleyan University.....	Middletown, Connecticut
West Virginia Wesleyan College.....	Buckhanon, West Virginia
Western College for Women.....	Oxford, Ohio
Western Reserve University.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Westminster College.....	Fulton, Missouri
Westminster College.....	New Wilmington, Pennsylvania
Wheaton College.....	Wheaton, Illinois
Wheaton College.....	Norton, Massachusetts
Whitman College.....	Walla Walla, Washington
Whittier College.....	Whittier, California
Wilberforce University.....	Wilberforce, Ohio
William Woods College.....	Fulton, Missouri
Wittenberg College.....	Springfield, Ohio
Wooster, College of.....	Wooster, Ohio
Worcester Polytechnic Institute.....	Worcester, Massachusetts
Wilmington College.....	Wilmington, Ohio
Yankton College.....	Yankton, South Dakota
York College.....	York, Nebraska

*This list of members includes all colleges that joined during the first year, Feb. 1, 1915-Jan. 31, 1916.*

The Secretary was ordered by the Association to list colleges as "members" and "associate members", but at the time of going to press he did not have sufficient information to warrant his making the distinction.

## THE SPHERE AND POSSIBILITIES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

ROBERT L. KELLY, PRESIDENT OF EARLHAM COLLEGE.

To answer the question thus propounded, with any degree of finality, requires an insight into existing conditions, and a prophetic gift which the present speaker does not possess. He can only say that a year ago one hundred and fifty college executives assembled at this place from all parts of the United States, prompted chiefly no doubt by the impulse to get together, with a few definite ideas as to the possibilities of such a convention, and with a great sense of expectancy. By common consent it was agreed to form a permanent organization and some of the possibilities of such an association received tentative expression. We now have a somewhat ready-made Association with one hundred and ninety (190) members including various kinds of institutions, situated in all sections of the country. The uses to which the Association may be put will be determined by present and future needs. There is not much rigidity in the structure of the present organ and it is to be hoped that it will adjust itself to changing functions. There seems to be no doubt that it has in it the breath of life and this is its greatest promise for the future.

While admitting that the more or less blind American faith in the efficacy of organization is largely responsible for the existence of the Association of American Colleges, an effort may be made to formulate some definite ideas that were in the minds of the promoters. First of all it may be permissible to venture certain suggestions as to what the Association, at least at present, is not.

### **First. IT IS NOT A STANDARDIZING AGENCY.**

That is to say this is not its reason for being. Valuable service is being rendered to higher education by

some twenty or thirty such agencies now in active operation. It is equally certain that the work of standardization has not yet been completed. It is certain that new and now unthought of classifications will be demanded. The Association has already requested the Commissioner of Education to use a more accurate and comprehensive scheme for listing the colleges and universities of the country on the basis of control and this the Commissioner promptly consented to do. The Association has already accepted the invitation of the Commissioner of Education to join with the other associations under the leadership of the Bureau of Education in a study of the standards and equipment of American Colleges. The Association has authorized the appointment of a committee of two to assist the Secretary in collecting facts and statistics for a complete study or survey of the constituent colleges. The Association has distributed the tentative report of Dr. French's committee on the minimum college and is lending every possible assistance in this interesting study of the elements that make up an efficient college. A By-Law of the Association sets the requirement of fourteen units for admission and one hundred and twenty semester hours for graduation as the modest standard of eligibility to membership and provides that the latter requirement may be waived by a two-thirds vote.

The executive committee has announced the policy of the Association as one of inclusiveness and inter-helpfulness rather than exclusiveness. The underlying assumption suggested by this policy is that there are colleges and colleges and that excellence is not inconsistent with variety. There does not at present appear to be a demand that a National Association shall attempt to hoist in the air as a model for every American College a Platonic idea of the college. It is a fair question whether some colleges have not decreased rather than increased their efficiency by straining to meet some demand of standardization imposed from above or at least from with-

out, when the more normal functioning would have been realized in responding sympathetically to the immediate needs of the mass of its constituents. The Association will cooperate heartily therefore with existing agencies and if in the future it enters upon the task of standardizing American Colleges, it will be after much more data is at its command and by the process of self evaluation. It will strive to stimulate each college to be not so much like some other college as more like its own unrealized self.

### **Second. IT IS NOT AN IMPLEMENT OF DEFENSE**

The chief watch-word of this Association is not preparedness against its foes. The colleges of America are not frightened. They are not building a fortification behind which they may hide from their enemies. It is true the college is likely to be attacked in the future for it is being attacked savagely enough now. The high school is becoming supremely conscious of itself and in places it would encroach upon the field of the college from below. The University in like manner would reach down from above and appropriate some of the territory of the college. The high school would rob the college of its power to fix its entrance requirements and the university would determine its requirements for graduation. The tax-supported institutions would sap its vitality by demonstrating the complete ability of the state to educate all the children from the kindergarten to to the Doctor's degree and for the needlessness therefore of the independent foundation. A certain type of business man would point out the futility of college education as judged by the helplessness of the college product. The vocational expert would storm the centres of American culture with a pitchfork and a monkey-wrench. And worse than all this, certain builders of educational systems would actually ignore the college and go on about their business as though the college did not exist.

But this situation calls for more than defense. Mere preparedness will not suffice. Preparedness for even defensive conflict with the high school, the university, the business man, the vocationalist, would be the height of folly. None of these institutions or persons is an enemy of the college. The college should welcome criticism and should transform the critic into the friend. Is it too much to hope that this Association may assist in the coordinating of our educational energies? The interests of all these instrumentalities are indissolubly bound together. The college would absorb, not repel.

**Third. IT IS NOT AN IMPLEMENT OF CONQUEST.**

Neither is the Association called upon to wage offensive warfare. The college may be called upon to assert itself but not to fire shrapnel. The Association would pick no quarrels with these neighbors who are the friends of the college. It has no chip on its shoulder. It is not an Association for emphasizing differences or stirring up strife. It would not even draw odious comparisons. It would live peaceably with all men. It is convinced that the college has a place in the sun and that this place is guaranteed not by fortifications nor by implements of attack but by its fruits. The college should be willing to rest its case on its inherent serviceableness.

The Association would aspire to become an instrument for the accomplishment of at least three things.

**First. IT WOULD LEARN THE TRUTH ABOUT THE COLLEGE.**

This can only be done by investigation, by report and by discussion. There are a few things we know about the college. It is an indigenous plant. It occupies a unique place in the history of education. It has made an amazing contribution to American life. It has been a conservator of culture in a rapidly changing socie-

ty. The forests have been hewn down, roads have been built, rivers have been bridged, virgin prairies have been turned into garden spots and all the other material activities incident to transforming a newly discovered world into a luxurious home for millions of men have followed each other in bewildering succession and might have wholly engrossed the minds of men except for the influence—direct and indirect—of the college and college man. And yet this influence has not been dwelt upon. It has not been successfully pointed out. It is not adequately appreciated even by college men much less by the general public whose attention is attracted by more spectacular movements. Few college administrators have made an exhaustive study of their own institutions, and fewer still would claim intimate acquaintance with the college in general. We do not know the college; we only know a few things about the college. In recent years certain great Boards have rendered valuable service in making studies of college conditions and in pointing out tendencies good and bad in college development but even today the Bureau of Education laments the lack of knowledge about the colleges or of where to go to get the desired information.

It would be well if college administrators could be given a course in the history of the American college and yet where shall they find this historic statement? If such a narrative existed it would serve as an excellent back-ground for the study of existing conditions in present day colleges. Here is an attractive and undeveloped field for the college historian. Most of our information is scrappy and superficial not to say unreliable. Now and then a chronicler declares that he has visited twenty or a hundred colleges and is therefore competent to meet out praise or blame upon some specific phase of college life. And yet his conclusions are not accepted by those who have a more intimate knowledge of a few institutions or of one institution. Is it too much to expect, for instance, that in annual reports of college offi-



cials, there may be enough similarity of purpose and method, so that significant totals and averages may be arrived at and conclusions reached of actual scientific value. Might not this Association be a means of furnishing data for the construction of a science of college pedagogy? If the Association could even partially eliminate the self-appointed framer of interminable questionnaires it would receive the lively gratitude of college registrars. If the Association can set before college administrators certain specific tasks and can secure free and full exposition and discussion of vital phases of college life and control, some contribution may be made to a science of college administration. Such an exchange of views should tend to clarify the minds of those who feel the need of a few reliable forms to guide them in the perilous task to which they have set their hands and consecrated their lives.

The college has displayed tremendous vitality. The secrets of its power are not well understood but it is significant that those who have studied the problem of the college most thoroughly and under the most illuminating conditions are a unit in the conviction that its place in the educational system is secure and that its future is destined to be even more glorious than its past. This Association then would assist the college in understanding itself.

#### **Second. IT WOULD TELL THE TRUTH ABOUT THE COLLEGE**

That is to say it would afford a medium of communication of what is known. What one college has done successfully should be known to the other members of the Association. Perhaps it is too much to expect that colleges will report what they have done unsuccessfully. The Association should be a clearing house of worthwhile information. This is the meaning perhaps of the interhelpfulness phase of the Association's program. If a member of the Association has solved the problem of



freshmen mortality he should pass the good word along. If a member knows how to manage a man's dormitory he should proclaim the secret to his perplexed associates. The college world now and then has had held up for its admiration a very old or honorable or wealthy institution and exhortations have been given in distressing abundance. It is said that in a certain barnyard a bantam hen once had pointed out to her an ostrich egg and she was enjoined to "look at that and do her best". A service will be rendered indeed if this Association can point the way to college administrators who are striving to guide the destinies of institutions that are neither old nor rich but that nevertheless do have a field and an opportunity. Much may be learned from the experiences of the colonial college now become well established, and from the college inbedded in the heart of a great university whose work is done with reference to the requirements of graduate and professional schools, and much may be learned also from the younger and the detached institution, struggling in poverty, it may be, breathing the air of freedom and with grim determination and a good conscience serving its day and generation. Let us have the story of the different types of colleges and let us all of one accord join in the many-sided task of shaping the liberal education of a nation.

But the general public, the public which is so frequently misinformed and misled, should be able to hear the truth about the college. The Association should assist the college in asserting itself. This does not mean that it should enter upon a flamboyant process of self-advertisement. The traditions of the college should be preserved, and one of those traditions is modesty and conservatism. But the Association should contribute to the making known and the perpetuation of the traditions of the college. In dignified but in none the less persistent fashion it should proclaim the ideals for which the college stands and marshal the facts and ideas which support those ideals. If college administrators

tors know their mission and believe in their mission it follows that they should proclaim their mission. The America of tomorrow will need the college even more than did the America of yesterday and the America of to-day should know that this is true.

There are special reasons why this publicity is called for at the present stage in the development of American education. Not many years ago the college had unchallenged occupancy of the field of higher learning in this country. It did not state its claim to this monopoly for its position was not questioned. In recent years some virile educational institutions have arisen and they have not been backward in publishing abroad their claim to recognition. The development of the state university has been a marvelous phenomenon. The present rise of the high school has added another wonder to our interesting collection. The Department of Superintendence of the N. E. A. is exerting tremendous power. The tendency of college men has been to stand aside and witness these remarkable unfoldings and to enter into the general chorus of congratulations that American education is bursting forth in such new life. But not all the ideals of American education can be promulgated by these newer instruments of educational progress. The college must let its voice be heard. It must do more. It must guarantee certain features of American education that are in danger of being lost sight of. It must render its contribution to the general progress. The proposed campaign for Christian education is a case in point. Here is a phase of education that must not be neglected except at the peril of our Republic. Religion is the crown of education and American education must not be uncrowned. Here is a field in which the function of the denominational or independent college stands forth in pronounced relief. From center to circumference the country must hear the message again that righteousness exalteth a nation, that the chief end of education is the building of character not the building of bridges. The

colleges which comprise this Association can contribute much to this propaganda. The colleges must not be too modest or too dignified to proclaim certain fundamental truths from the housetops. There is some educational crusading that the colleges may appropriately engage in. In a word, the college would not only understand itself; the college would be understood.

### **FINALLY, THE ASSOCIATION WOULD MAKE BETTER COLLEGES.**

The fundamental purpose of the Association is to raise the standard of higher education in this country. It would illuminate the minds and strengthen the purpose of college administrators. It would cultivate the spirit among college men of discontent with present attainment. It would strive to give them a better personal equipment for their complicated and difficult tasks. It would increase their resourcefulness, as a speaker suggested a year ago, by giving them "a free and steady flow of fresh ideas, together with a belief in some of them". It would encourage openmindedness toward measures and toward men. By bringing together two hundred men and women with different equipment, background, outlook, personalities, opinions and opportunities but with a common desire to serve humanity and God by fostering the soundest training of youth, it would bring to the door of one college great or small, rich or poor, renowned or obscure, the wisdom, the faith, the energy of many colleges. It would impress each man with the magnitude of his task but hearten him with the offer of unexpected resources in accomplishing it. It would substitute the abounding courage of the group for the faltering hope of the individual. It would teach college executives to bear one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ.

The positive suggestions of this paper are three: the Association of American Colleges would be a means of information, communication, inspiration.

## DISCUSSION.

THOMAS McCLELLAND, PRESIDENT OF KNOX COLLEGE.

The President's Address has done a most valuable service in making clear the present scope and future possibilities of this Association. In so doing he has also made a valuable contribution toward establishing the general policy of the Association of American Colleges.

I shall not attempt to discuss every part of the field covered by the address. In fact, I shall confine myself chiefly to a single phase of it; the college as an essential part of our educational system. I take it that no one of us is disposed to underrate the importance of the general university, the technical school or the vocational school. We gladly recognize the great value of these institutions in our present day educational system; but I want, if I may, to differentiate the institution which we are proud to call the American college. It antedated them all, if, indeed, it was not the common mother of them all. Here again the President's address has done a comprehensive work. It has covered the sphere of the college and entered into its purposes and possibilities so fully that little remains for me but to echo his views and underscore some of his suggestions. The Association of American Colleges has been organized to conserve all that is best in that kind of education for which the college, as such, stands. In attempting this important service I believe we shall in the future help each other most, not by formal addresses, but by a frank and somewhat detailed recital of experiences, and a comparison of the policies and methods pursued in the constituent colleges, with a free exchange of views with reference to them.

In doing this I do not think we are called upon to minimize in any degree the kind of education given by other kinds of institutions such as are represented by the State Universities, the technical schools or the variety of so-called vocational institutions. They belong

to the general system of education of which the college is an integral part; but we must recognize the fact that within its own sphere the American College has a field that is distinctively its own and I, for one, have no fear that it will be driven from this field if it holds true to its traditions, while adjusting itself to the changing needs, and expanding opportunities of the years as they go by.

I would lay special stress on holding steadfastly to these traditions of the old college in so far as the aim of the education which it offers is concerned. In the addition of departments and the multiplication of courses which seem to be demanded to meet the exigencies and opportunities of the present, let us never forget that the ultimate end is the development of the man; not, in the last analysis, the mastery of a subject or the acquisition of facts or familiarity with laws, but the development of the man, the culture of his mind and heart. We cannot reiterate too often that this is the liberal education for which the college has stood in the past and for which it must stand today, not exclusively, but pre-eminently so. Other divisions of our educational system recognize some responsibilities for this thing which we call culture, but as a rule it is only incidental to the method and purpose of the institution. With the college it is fundamental and I am fully persuaded that on the day when the college ceases to regard the development of the intellect, the sensibilities and the will of its students as the vital thing in its life, and this is but to say, as I have before said, the culture of mind and heart,—on that day will its decadence begin.

This presents a problem which is one of the most serious that the college administrator has to face: I refer to the selection of teachers. Where shall we find the men who have had the extensive training needed for the work of a college professor and who at the same time appreciate the importance of developing their students in accordance with the college idea. Alice Freeman Palmer, while President of Wellesley must have appre-

ciated this difficulty when she stated her three prime requisites for a college teacher and in order of their importance: first Address, second Character, third Scholarship, all essential but Scholarship last, when thinking of the needs and aims of the college.

President Judson, then Dean of Chicago University, in the course of his address on the evening of my inauguration, fifteen years ago, turned to me and said a thing which I have had occasion to recall again and again: "President McClelland, you will find your most difficult task while administering this institution, in keeping young men whom you may select for positions on your faculty from introducing into the work of the college the aims and methods of the university which have no place whatever in the college."

I am not forgetful of the fact that the announced policy of the Association is one of inclusiveness and interhelpfulness, rather than exclusiveness, and I fully agree with the comment of the President's address, that the underlying assumption suggested by this policy is that there are colleges and colleges and that excellence is not inconsistent with variety. I take it however that this has reference to different stages of progress rather than to radical or fundamental distinctions as to methods and aims. For instance, Harvard University and Knox College can hardly belong to the same class, if we take into account the numbers in each and the difference in equipment and teaching force, together with the professional and graduate schools which warrant the name University. But when it is understood that the college in Harvard University is still held not only by the Harvard Corporation but by the whole Harvard constituency to be the very heart of the institution, Knox I think may well be considered of the same kind because they hold in common the ideals and aims which we in this Association have been setting forth so persistently as the essential characteristics of a true college. Let us set



up, this standard for admission to the Association of American Colleges and we shall have a gauge which will allow the entrance of a large number of institutions varying in size and in different features of development, while holding to the central aim and method of the college.

As the President has pertinently said our Association is not a standardizing agency, at least is not so in a critical or authoritative sense. Rather it will feel free to make general suggestions as to the place and functions of that type of education for which the American College stands, allowing each institution to apply them to its own conditions and needs as best it may.

Before giving place to others for the discussion of the President's address I want to suggest that the Colleges of our order need not be so much concerned about the criticism from without, as about correcting our own defects and making the college we represent exemplify more fully the idea for which our institutions stand. We are not banding together for defense against any sort of hostility from without. That will take care of itself if we hold steadfastly to the course set for us.

In fact I think we are inclined to over estimate the opposition from other classes of schools. I must say that in my own experience I have not discovered the hostility of other schools not of our class. Indeed I am sure that most of us here have experienced a very cordial relationship, as I have, with the institutions not of our order; High schools, Normal schools, Technical schools and Universities, State and Non-State.

## A PROPOSED CAMPAIGN OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

REV. THOMAS NICHOLSON, D. D., CORRESPONDING SECRETARY OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE  
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

We shall discuss this proposed campaign of Christian education under three heads: (1) Its origin and purpose; (2) The need which it emphasizes; (3) The methods proposed.

### I. ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF THE MOVEMENT.

The Council of Church Boards is an organization now representing fourteen different denominational Boards of Education which are co-operating for the promotion of the ideals of higher education, particularly in the constituency of the Christian churches. The movement had its origin in 1911, when the General Secretaries of the educational work of three or four of the larger Protestant denominations held a conference in New York upon the possibility of some united action in the interests of Christian education, and planned a federation of the various church boards. The discussions resulted in an expressed conviction that a larger degree of co-operation between educational organizations within the churches was practicable and desirable; that it was possible to secure a better geographical distribution of denominational colleges; a better functioning of institutions; a desirable comity; a better understanding of the relation of the denominational colleges to state universities, independent colleges, high schools, and to the public school system. The Boards effected an organization which has held annual meetings and some special meetings. They have made a somewhat critical study of the problems involved, and with each recurring study, the conviction has grown upon them that among

the many things which they may properly try to do none is more important than that which is summed up in the Report of the Committee appointed at a recent meeting to draft a final statement of the scope and object of a proposed nation-wide campaign for the creation of a new sense of the value of the religious element in education. That Committee reported as follows:

Resolved, first that we define it as the comprehensive purpose of the proposed campaign to secure recognition and practical acceptance by the Christian forces of the country of the two fundamental principles: namely, that religion is an essential part of education, and that education is necessary to the adequate achievement of the aim of the Christian religion.

Second, that we recognize that in the address made and in the literature issued in connection with this campaign, these principles will require to be affirmed and defended in their full scope; and that the importance of religious education within the home and in the church, and the exertion of the influences of religion in connection with education of all kinds, whether under private or public auspices, will demand exposition and enforcement; and also that denominational and local conditions must determine to a considerable extent the precise emphasis which shall be laid on different occasions on the various phases of the whole subject.

Third, that in the interest of concentration, with a view to effectiveness, we judge it expedient that the primary objective of this campaign be the recognition of the permanent necessity of higher education under distinctly Christian auspices and influence, and the deepening of interest on the part of the Christian people of the country in those colleges and other institutions of higher learning which by their Christian character are specially adapted to the development of the leaders of the church and in the Christianizing of all higher education.

## II. THE NEED.

We ask, then, Is there a real need for such a movement? Many hold that modern life is becoming secularized, that the religious view of the world is becoming obsolete, and that the religious consciousness is weak-

ening. Others do not hesitate to assert that religion is a diminishing force, no longer of any particular value as a factor in higher education. The causes of this attitude are in part scientific and in part popular. The amazing literary, historic and scientific investigations and accumulations of recent years have given the world a body of facts intricate almost beyond conception, but altogether imposing. These demand new adjustments in every line of human thinking. The time was when a scholar like Aristotle or Leibnitz could compass practically the entire range of human knowledge. No one to-day, whatever his native endowment or industry, can hope to do more than to acquaint himself with the method of scientific study, to command in detail a very limited field of investigation, and to familiarize himself superficially with the general results of the various lines of study other than his own. The task of interpretation constantly becomes more difficult, and the intellectual problem of bringing under an adequate world-view the vast materials of science, is now almost a hopeless one. This has led to a state of perplexity and even of impotence in the face of certain problems of ethical and religious import, for which traditional conceptions are no longer adequate. Many views formerly believed to involve grave moral and practical issues have all but disappeared after a bitter struggle; others have slipped out of thought unawares. A new spirit of toleration has come with the influx of vast foreign populations, bringing other ways of thinking and other conceptions of life. The church has been accustomed to view the Bible from the angle of verbal inspiration and to regard Christian institutions in their age-long forms as so minutely of divine origin that it was sacrilege to modify them. Theology was not regarded as a progressive science, nor church institutional life as a developing organism. All this has changed or is changing that many have been bewildered or have concluded that there was little of permanent value in religion.

The multiplicity of interests has prevented them from realizing that a similar process had been going on with almost everything else. A part of the difficulty in the case of religion has grown out of the very sanctity with which it was regarded and the divine elevation which was accorded it. A countless array of complications has grown out of the divisions among the churches, conflicting laws and judicial decisions upon an intricate subject, rendered more so by the psychology of sectarian prejudices or of rationalistic pre-suppositions, and by a diversity of educational aims, methods and agencies.

The man of average intelligence has grown weary of sectarian controversies which he is more and more coming to see were born of a wrong view of biblical inspiration and a distressingly imperfect method of biblical and literary interpretation. Strange as it may seem, the church has not infrequently been a barrier to the incorporation of religious instruction in all higher education. The details of practical school administration could not be adjusted to the problem in the face of petty jealousies and sectarian bickerings, and objections on the part of narrow devotees of denominationalism. Moreover, we have often been unwilling to have religion and religious subjects taught by modern scientific and pedagogical methods. Religion in the college has been insisted upon too exclusively in the form of denominational propaganda. There is no more intrinsic reason for excluding the Bible and the literature of the Old and the New Testaments from the subjects of study in our colleges and universities than there is for throwing out the works of Tennyson, Browning or Shakespeare. Why should there be any more hesitancy in studying the history of the Christian Church than in studying the history of the Italian republics or the development of the great nations of Western Europe? The Christian Church has more profoundly influenced American civilization, and the Christian ideals have had more to

do with the evolution of our American life, than any of the secular civilizations of the Old World; and yet, under existing modern conditions, neither of these things can be done in certain of our institutions of learning.

Another difficulty is that a generation ago the church was the center of the educational, social, and religious life of the community. In our day many of the functions formerly discharged by the church have been taken over by the state and by private enterprise. Systematic charity, like education, formerly the exclusive care of the church, has also gained wide legislative and public support. This has led many devoted churchmen to fear that any further surrender of functions might result in the decline of the church as we know it. This Council of Church Boards believes that there is need of a well-organized educational movement to overcome all these difficulties and to create a new sense of the value of religion in education.

In the face of all I have just said and much more which might be recited, we hold that the abandonment of the religious point of view or the elimination of the religious spirit would mean an irreparable loss to culture, a calamity to social progress, and the degredation of human life. Religion is not an organism which has outlived its functions. It is not the relic of an erroneous pre-scientific world view. It is one of the normative and practical forces of human life, and one of the permanent elements in the greatest individual character, or in any really permanent civilization.

This is not the place to discuss comprehensively the nature and the character of religion. We may, however, properly observe that in its true interpretation it is a belief in a Being higher and mightier than man, inaccessible to his senses, but not indifferent to his sentiments and actions, with the feelings and practices which flow from such a belief. It is communion with this personal Being, a sense of relationship there-



to, a sense of dependence thereon, with all the thoughts, emotions and actions which proceed from such a relation. Religion is neither belief, emotion, attitude of will, morality touched with emotion, or conduct, when any one of these is considered separately. It is a relation, an outlook, an attitude, and a theory of life, and it includes all these aforementioned elements in some measure combined. It is a confidence that events are being overruled by a Supreme and Lasting Good, a conviction that the universe is Divinely ordered, it is an attitude of co-operation with the Power which makes for righteousness and for human perfection.

Now, my first observation is that the church, the organized institution for the preservation and extension of religion among men, needs the college and what the college stands for. If religion is to be preserved, and if the religious view of the world is to be maintained, the convictions of their worth must come as the results not of dogmatic teachings or authoritative prescription, but as the outcome of a reasoned confidence that they are coherent, that they are consistent with the body of human experience, that they are a normal part of man's constitutional development, that they are adaptable, indeed capable of new confirmations with each new addition to the stock of human knowledge. The better understanding and the more complete organization of existing fact and truth should deepen conviction of their soundness and intrinsic worth. Theology, if it is to maintain the honored place among the other sciences which it has heretofore occupied, and which I believe it should occupy, must be a progressive science whose determinations are reached by scientific method. It must be a true philosophy of religion. The question of the permanent place and abiding significance of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures is one of deep and nation-wide importance. These writings, composed of men of exceptional religious insight and moral genius, are invaluable as materials for religious

and ethical culture. But we clearly understand that their credentials for the thinking man of to-day must be more than the names of the writers who are supposed to have produced them, or the miraculous events by which they are said to have been authenticated. They must commend themselves to the instructed intelligence and conscience. They must be a genuine contribution to the wisdom of the race. They must be so interpreted in terms of present day living that they may enter into the lives of men, to deepen, ransom and enfranchise. The books of the Bible exemplify all the cardinal qualities of the righteous, God-fearing man; they inculcate with impressive eloquence the great domestic and civic virtues on which the permanent welfare of the community depends, and they give a true account of the nature, character, and the ultimately distressing effects of sin. The Old Testament as well as the New enunciates moral and religious truths of permanent and universal validity, exhibits the earlier stages of a great redemptive process in which God Himself takes possession of human souls and through the operation of His Spirit becomes in man the inspiration of his thoughts and actions in such a way as to create a new moral personality. It abjures formalism and discloses religion as a practical force which becomes a powerful element in renovating human nature and in transforming human society. Give these Scriptures a fair chance, and they will prove their own credentials in the form of a marvelous productivity of moral, social, and spiritual power, and of manifold movements for the enrichment of human life and the extension of these blessings which spring from a nobler and a more widely prevalent human brotherhood. Christianity's ethical significance is not so much in its codes as such, as it is in the new conceptions of God, life, and morality, which it has given to the world. It affirms a divine origin and destiny for man. It invests life with an indefeasible sacredness because it makes it a divine service and a great mission. It makes all men children of a common Fath-

er, heirs alike of eternal life, and it opens the door to a new conception of perfection—a perfection in which men must under all conditions, always and universally, live in right relations before the ideal society can be realized. Religion in its proper function is a force which awakens the sleeping conscience, reveals the secret things of the soul, tears the mask from moral perversion, humiliates false pride, and convinces man of the existence of a loving Father who has the power to lead him into a new life where sin is consumed in the flame of a higher emotional love, which in turn becomes the source of an inward joy, the life of an undying hope, and the power of a new personality.

If religion is to be kept true to these adaptable and vital interpretations, it must be kept close to developing intellectual forces. I have a friend who is possessed by a spirit of parsimony. He is in a way quite a progressive fellow, but it hurts him to part with anything he has ever found useful, so he keeps old machines, superannuated tools, every sort of useless instrument, fondly explaining that it has been a useful servant in the past and it may come to be useful again sometime. He has thus accumulated a great mass of old truck which is forever in his way. The storage and insurance rates are costly. There is practically no hope of any further service from the junk. It often keeps him from employing newer and more progressive methods, but he has invested it with a sort of sacredness which forbids its destruction. Something not unlike that has occasionally occurred in the Christian church. There are permanent religious conceptions which cannot be superannuated or outgrown, but there is need of a keen discrimination between the human and the really divine elements in Christian thinking. The Bible and true religion must not be waterlogged by the accretions of sectarianism or misguided interpretation. Our Christian structure must rest upon the foundations of the real teachings of the Master, the true and permanent communications of the Divine Being. Now, for seren-

ity and breadth in Christian thought, for the scientific separation of superstition and bigotry from real and vital religion, for the discovery and correct understanding of the really permanent in revelation and in religious development, the church needs the method and the processes of the college. The Master said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." We know God as we come to know the truth. The converse is, however, in my judgment equally true. We come to know the truth best and in fullest scope as we come to know God. There is an esoteric as well as an exoteric element in religion, but the church needs the college and the forces of higher education especially just now.

My next observation is that the college and higher education need the church. They sadly need religion. It would be possible to show through the history of the ages that the religious impulse has been closely identified with every higher intellectual impulse. One of the most noted educators of the last generation had a remarkable lecture, the thesis of which was that you could draw a perfect parallel through the centuries between the general excellence or degradation of a given civilization and the general exaltation and perfection of that nation's idea of God, and its devotion to that ideal. Let me instance only two or three things. The Protestant Reformation, whose four hundredth anniversary we are to celebrate in this campaign, was almost concurrently an intellectual and a religious awakening and transformation. That movement produced a new Oxford and a new Cambridge. It produced great universities in Scotland. It set in motion the forces out of which developed all our early American colleges, and it was really the inspiration of our American higher education. It is a matter of common knowledge that practically all the higher institutions of learning in this country were on religious foundations. The great modern foundations, like the Rockefeller and the Carnegie Boards, and the United States Bureau of Education, have been

doing a work of inestimable value in educational investigation and research. They have given us many facts and they have made most illuminating reports of various kinds. It occurred to your speaker that no investigation had been made of the value of the religious element in American education. We suggested to this Council of Church Boards the wisdom of such an investigation. We are able to give some preliminary results of the survey. They indicate a mine of priceless value. For instance, it seems pretty clear that we can establish on the basis of the methods of modern statistical investigation the fact that as the earlier educational foundations were religious, so religion continues to be the mightiest single factor preserving the higher education and inspiring young people to seek it.

In one of the great Middle States we took the religious census made by the Government in 1906. We found that 37% of the total population were communicants of the Protestant churches. We then took statistics of the religious membership of the college students of that state gathered by the Christian Associations and by the Federal Council of Churches, and we discovered that about 75% of all the students in all the colleges, state and denominational, were furnished by that 37% of the population which belonged to the Christian churches. But these statistics were necessarily imperfect. We were not sure that they made keen discrimination between the church members and those who acknowledged a church affiliation, and we were not sure of their absolute accuracy, so we went a little further. We secured the results of an investigation in a single institution. This was a tax supported institution with more than two thousand students. As careful an analysis of that student body was made as could be made by the pastors, the Association workers, and the college authorities. The result showed that in a year when by compilation of the church year books the Protestant church membership of that state was about 42% of the total population, 83% of that student body were either



church members—and they were largely members—or came from Protestant Christian homes and acknowledged church affiliation and church attendance.

We then took this in a still narrower field. We took a single denomination, and being a Methodist I chose my own denomination. We had the facilities for investigation there. The results showed that in a state where 5% of the total population were Methodist church communicants, the student body of all the colleges were 22% Methodist communicants, that in another state where 8% of the total population were Methodist church communicants, 29% of all the students in the institutions of higher learning that year were Methodist communicants. The Methodist members come in good proportion from the farmer and artisan ranks. There are comparatively few rich people, but in one of these states where we sought out the fact we found that the Congregationalists had a still higher percentage in proportion to their numbers. By various other investigations we have become convinced that we can show the religious impulse and the religious inspiration to be one of the greatest and most potent educational impulses at work in our country to-day. We do not claim that the results stated are final or beyond contradiction, but it is one purpose of this interdenominational campaign to secure as careful an investigation of the value of the religious element in education as other investigators have secured for other elements that make or mar higher education, and we propose to subject all our investigations to the most rigid scrutiny. They will be open to scientific criticism but we feel sure of the approximate results and we propose to get these results and to give them to the American people as a patriotic duty.

In the same way I think it can be shown that the greatest single factor producing in our American people the gratifying liberality they are showing in the support of higher education can be traced more than to anything else to the religious impulse and the religious



motive. Here is a great field for investigation. It is a significant fact that the greatest single private benefactor of higher education in this country is a religious man, moved by a religious impulse, and that he placed his most signal educational beneficence on a religious foundation. A single religious denomination has in less than five years raised over twelve million dollars by popular subscription for its colleges, the number of subscribers running into the thousands, and the amounts ranging from ten dollars to twenty-five thousand each.

Again, it can be shown that the religious impulse in morals and in ethics is one of the most vital factors. There is a great field for investigation as to the per cent of student wastage which has gone to the educational scrapheap, and as to the forces which have retarded or accelerated the process.

Now, we have a peculiar institution in American education called the college. It is unique. It has had a great influence on American life and particularly on American social, moral and national leadership. It has been fiercely attacked in recent years. It is called an anomaly. It is predicted that it is destined rapidly to pass away. There are educators of note who make bold to argue that in any influence we may exert on the backward nations of the earth who are just now creating modern educational systems, we must not attempt to incorporate anything like the American college in their new systems. I, for one, do not believe it. Thirty years of study and nearly twenty-five years of the most active participation in constructive educational work, convince me that the American college is one of the priceless possessions of the American nation, and that if we are true to our ideals, it will be of more commanding service in the future than it has been in the past. An intelligent man who respects the good opinion of scientifically trained men must defend his convictions with cogent reasons in the forum of open discussion. I am ready for the contest. When men tell me that life is short, that American youth will not take

time to go through academy or high school after the grades, then through four years of college, then through professional or specialized vocational school, I reply, "It all depends on whether we set that ideal before them, and whether we convince them of the wisdom of such a standard." The objection about the length of time which must be spent in preparation is to me an ever-diminishing factor. It is not the length of a life, but the quality of that life which makes it worth while. Better thirty years of Paul than the nine hundred and sixty-nine years of Methuselah. High school and Freshman years are drill, discipline, preparation. Where shall we find time or place for those studies in literature, in philosophy, in religion, in ethics, in sociology, which enrich the life, which teach a man what he is and what he is for, which familiarize him with the eternal values—those humanizing studies which give him the greatest enlargement of vision and of life, if we do not make a place for them in the training of the men who are to be the future leaders in society and who are to set the standards of thought for the common people? And where shall we adequately provide for them, if we eliminate the Junior and Senior years from our colleges? Shall we on the one hand leave the scientifically prepared man to leap over into the highly furnished school of technology or of law or of medicine, and lose himself in the intensities of professional life or in the accumulation of wealth or of power? Or shall we make a place for that culture which provides him with the knowledge which makes life worth living, which gives him the social and the eternal outlook and the personal in-look, And has he the time? Has he the money? What is the meaning of the increasing wealth of this American continent? I tremble when I think of possibilities in the perversion of the billions which are every year added to our national resources and which are sure to be added in increasing ratio. What is it to mean? Is it simply to mean an increasing struggle of the masses against the classes, an increasing accumulation

of great fortunes, an increasing luxury and self-indulgence for the classes? If so, the nation is doomed. It ought to mean, and it may mean, if we are true to our principles, increasing opportunity for culture, for study, for the development of a life that is worth while. It ought to make it possible for the young manhood and young womanhood of this favored land to earn enough in half their time or less to amply provide them with leisure for the enjoyment of the larger things of life, and for the culture of the spirit. It ought to teach them how to use that leisure in the things which help them toward God and heaven and not toward the slums. If you will study deeply the situation in Europe to-day, you will see that no inconsiderable element in the cause of that appalling catastrophe is the accumulation of unsocialized wealth and power. Mutual suspicion of rapidly expanding wealth, of the possibilities of new forces created by new intellectual power, with disregard of the ties of human brotherhood which ever accompanies selfish love of power,—these are potent elements. Considering the amazing expansion of American wealth, I make bold to say the true patriots are those who help to socialize and Christianize the accumulated riches, not by the mechanical schemes of a crude socialism, but by teaching enlarged views of the meaning of life, teaching Christian stewardship, teaching men how to get and use wealth for the glory of God and the common good of all mankind. The final solution of the problem of the distribution of wealth must be a Christian solution. It must be based on the dignity and the essential laws of human brotherhood.

The religious impulse and the Christian ideal are among the most potent influences known to man for saving a college life from the purely mercenary, uselessly social, icily selfish, sodden, sensual elements. They do it through the power of high ideals, for once a man has seen the Christ in His true proportions, he can never again carve on the level of Venus. They do it through the institution's Associational life. They do it

because Christianity furnishes a powerful spiritual dynamic. What we need, after all, is not higher ethical code or purer ethical teachings, so much as we need a new moral energy to help men to live up to ethical codes they already know, and the power of religious devotion properly directed and properly enlightened has been proved over and over again to be one of the greatest sources of moral energy known to man. John R. Mott has recently recited some striking testimony on this point from Yuan Shi Kai and other observers in the Orient.

Here again our investigation department is of great value. There are Central Western States, rich almost beyond tabulation, with great colleges and universities, which nevertheless have counties without a single student, others with half a dozen or less, in any of the higher institutions of learning within the state. In one of these states where complaint has been made concerning the needless multiplication of colleges, an investigation of the young people of college age shows that after deducting half for those who for various reasons could not hope to go to college, and those who for good reasons ought not to be urged to go, enough young people who normally ought and could take such training were left to fill three times over twice as many colleges as the state now possesses. What tremendous enlargement of American life, what marvelous uplift of our national ideals, if all these young people could be given the kind of education for which I am pleading. This campaign is intended to stir up hundreds, yea, thousands of them to seek it.

And that leads again to the suggestion that these colleges must be amply endowed and equipped. It is almost a crime in our day, with our wealth and all our opportunities, to leave our young people to be the prey of cheap and inefficient colleges. And nowhere are we more culpable than in our teaching of religion. It will not be possible in our day at least, for the state and the state institutions properly to teach religious sub-

jects. I am in thorough sympathy with the effort to take the best possible religious care of young people at these tax-supported institutions. In sympathy with it, did I say? I regard it as an imperative duty. I have no patience with that species of narrowness which fears that the church college will be put out of business if we take proper care of these young people at the state and independent colleges. I am opposed to any unfair methods; opposed to everything unethical in our approach; opposed to sectarian propaganda; though I believe that Christianity functions, and must function through the churches, and that the individual denominations in the main must care for this work. That is a question of method. I profoundly believe that in America we have the possibility of the greatest educational system ever yet planned. It may be in part state, and in part private and independent. The two types react and mutually supplement each other. The state institution must respond to popular will, while our republican ideals exist. It must provide for an increasingly large percentage of our population. The work of education in America a generation ago outran private benevolence. There will be an increasingly predominant percentage of the total student age of the country in the tax-supported institutions. But over against them it is fundamental to the welfare of our nation that we shall preserve the independent and privately endowed institution which stands for an ideal. It educates public sentiment. It is a steadying force, when our popular clamor might run away with us. It is the Senate in our national educational Congress. If it is true to God and to its ideals, it will exert an influence in the shaping of public sentiment out of all proportion to the money invested and the numbers it counts. It will purify the stream of religious teaching and keep Christian interpretation abreast of the progress of knowledge. It will accept and constantly profit by the challenge to scientific method which the secular institution offers. It will itself be a constant challenge to



state education to be hospitable to Christian ideals. As endowments increase, it will be more and more independent, though it ought never to break with the church. Its independence is different from and greater than that of the tax-supported institution, and that very independence is its fortune. It may thus become the chief factor in shaping our national ideals.

Furthermore, it can specialize in these humanitarian and religious subjects as the state institutions cannot. If it does not do so, it is blind to its greatest opportunity. It can be a powerful factor in furnishing professors who will give to tax-supported education the very highest type of manhood and teaching power.

In this connection let me say that not long since I was emphasizing this very thing in the presence of the president of one of the great universities of the Middle West. At the close of my address he heartily endorsed what I had said, and added, "Through a period of years I have kept a list of the most successful men of our faculty and of the men not engaged who were considered available for and worthy of teaching positions. They have been in a very large percentage faithful members of the Christian churches, in large measure the product of the smaller colleges." And he added, "Sixty per cent of them have belonged to your own church."

The teacher is the school. What opportunities there are in the teaching of history, the teaching of literature, the teaching of the social sciences, for the inculcation of the highest religious ideals! Wendell Phillips said, "The honors we grant mark how high we stand, and they educate the future. The men we honor and the maxims we lay down in measuring our favorites, show the level and the morals of the time." So the characters the teacher praises, the ideals the teacher incidentally endorses, the movements he elucidates sympathetically, the spirit in which he teaches, are things of tremendous power. Without any direct preachment, youth may be made reverent, obedient and devout in the presence of truth and of right. Colleges of the type



of our best Christian institution, amply endowed, kept thoroughly respectable educationally, emphasizing their Christian ideal, making no apology for it, but proud of their heritage and showing their loyalty in a quiet and unostentatious way, will be the most powerful single factor in furnishing the right kind of teachers for our tax-supported colleges; preachers for the pulpits of the land, and leaders for all moral, social, and religious movements. They will also be a chief factor in furnishing a lay leadership, intelligent, open-minded, cultured, brainy. We must have a leadership which has convictions, not as a result of the blind following of tradition but because it has reached intelligent, personal conclusions. It takes the right atmosphere to develop that sort of spiritual health. This leadership will help to create a public sentiment which will keep those tax-supported institutions true to Christian ideals. It is a cause for gratification that nearly all the presidents of our great state universities are at the present time earnest Christian men—men like James in Illinois, Bryan in Indiana, Benton in Vermont, Thompson in Ohio. So you may go the rounds. I would keep it so. No single factor in American life will do more to help us keep it so than the preservation of this group of strong, well equipped, distinctively Christian colleges. There is an increasing desire upon the part of the tax-supported institutions to have it so. Some of the strongest words spoken in recent years for the right kind of small college have been spoken by State university presidents, and presidents of such institutions who are increasingly friendly to these church colleges are wise men indeed. It will be a part of this campaign to emphasize in the public mind this broad view of the complementary relation of the two groups of institutions.

We are in the midst of changing world civilizations. Mr. Carnegie is reported to have said some years ago, "The future patriotism will not be a national patriotism but a race patriotism." This was a step in the right direction, but he did not go far enough. It must

be a *world* patriotism. The ultimate care for such a conflict as is now raging in Europe is to make actually vital in human life the Christian ideals of universal brotherhood, universal helpfulness, and the universally complementary character of world civilizations. We used to have an age of cut-throat competition. We have come to a realizing sense of the value of combination and coöperation. We used to have bitter sectarian rivalries. They are lessening. We have fallen upon a ripening era of church federation. We used to have narrow state bigotry. We have an increasingly growing federal ideal. We used to regard all outside nations as heathen and alien. We are now coming to a sense of world-fellowship and of the value of world intercourse. We used to have exclusive educational ideals. We have now come to appreciate the value of the exchange professorship. We shall go on until in time we shall really realize Tennyson's vision of "the parliament of man, the federation of the world." We shall see that the perfected life must incorporate the best that has been thought and the noblest that has been lived by all races. We shall learn from the mystic contemplation of the Orient, as well as from the aggressive, thorough spirit of the Teuton.

The Christian impulse has furnished culture with the great missionary impact. It was the Christian missionary who planted schools and colleges in the Balkans, in Turkey, in China, in Japan, in the isles of the sea. Missionaries have promoted the reconstruction of laws, the reform of judicial procedure, aided in the renovation and the amelioration of administrative methods, elevated the standard of government service, furthered proper international relations, and made large and unique contributions to the world's store of knowledge. They have performed tasks requiring genuine scholarship, such as the publication of hundreds of volumes, monumental labors in lexicography, and in the reduction of obscure languages, which existed only in confused spoken idioms, to written forms; in the crea-

tion of many a literature; and they have made important contributions to comparative philosophy. Moreover, the missionary has proven himself an explorer and a geographer of the first rank; an archaeological discoverer; a student and a discoverer in biology, geology, botany, zoölogy; a scientific physician making medical discoveries of world-wide significance; and withal, a most important factor in international diplomacy and in political movements of world scope.

More than all other factors combined, these Christian forces have been bringing together the nations of the earth. The world federation, so highly desirable, waits more emphatically on the Christian impulse and the vitalization of the Christian forces than on anything else known to man. This campaign will help to make this vivid in the public eye.

The history of religion and of religious movements is of incalculable value to human society. What transformations the Wesleyan Movement wrought in England! What a contrast between France and England in the days of the French Revolution, and what an interesting study is that of the forces which made the difference! What kind of types of religious life and enthusiasm have produced the most permanent and valuable results? Here is a study worth while. I have said enough to show the scope and value of what we are undertaking.

### III. JUST A WORD AS TO THE METHOD.

The plans are in the making. They will develop. But roughly speaking, we now have a temporary secretary. He is about to open an office in the Presbyterian Building in New York. He will direct these investigations. He will outline the constructive plans. He will help to prepare the literature. He will outline the organization. He will prepare the way for the permanent secretary to be chosen a little later. When these facts are before us and the plans are well matured, we shall work not so much, I think, by great conventions,

but rather by conferences, by small gatherings of important leaders from all the denominations; by bringing together representative men who do the thinking for communities. We shall work through the churches, through other existing organizations, through the colleges themselves, through the home and through the Sunday-school. We shall use every endeavor to awaken the public conscience on this subject. Out of that awakening we shall expect three or four results.

(1) A new sense of the real value of the religious element in education.

(2) A larger and more intelligent incorporation of the subjects which center around religion in the curricula of the colleges. I think we shall not live ten years longer until we shall find that provision will be made such as has never yet been made for credit in such studies in all institutions of higher learning. One great difficulty now restraining the colleges from the satisfactory teaching of the Bible, of Christian ethics, the Philosophy of Religion, and similar subjects, is the inability of the student to get any recognition in the way of credit for studies thus pursued when he transfers to a state or other large university. I think we shall get that cured.

(3) A larger liberality toward the denominational college. These colleges must be amply endowed. I do not know that we shall attempt to unify our efforts in this direction through an interdenominational financial campaign, but I do think we shall at least aid in helping each of the denominations to make a new and more successful appeal to its constituency, the result of which will be the ample endowment of its full quota of colleges in the country.

(4) Out of that I think we shall get what up to this time has been impossible, namely, a better federation of the denominations in educational work. The respective colleges will no longer be rivals, practicing unethical methods of student or money getting. They will be partners in a great work, and they will more

and more eliminate useless rivalries, reproachful multiplication of forces, and corresponding waste of men and money. These involve large and delicate problems. Progress will be slow, but there will surely be progress.

Some years ago I went with a friend to hear the oratorio, "The Messiah." There was a great orchestra of sixty pieces or more. There was a chorus of some three hundred voices. It was the perfection of music of its kind. When they reached the Hallelujah Chorus we all stood in reverence or in rapture. I looked around and there stood a member of the family of my friend, a deaf mute whom he had placed in one of the most available seats in the nearest gallery. She stood looking out vacantly at the orchestra, the chorus and the crowd. All that sublime music was to her as if it had not been. All that great composition almost as useless as if it had never been written, and I said, "Oh, the pity of it; Oh, the pity of it!" But there are mighty forces in our nation almost as much ignored by many of our people as if they did not exist, and I say, "The pity of it; the pity of it!" Here are millions of money wasted in useless extravagance, money which might be turned into the endowment and equipment of great institutions, and the men who would give it would be richer after they had given it than they were when they were keeping it. They are as blind to the opportunity and as dead to the richness of the service they might render as the deaf mute at the oratorio, and I say, "The pity of it; the pity of it!" We must awake the dead. And here are hundreds and thousands of our young people whose lives might be enlarged in time and whose eternity can be made infinitely richer for culture such as that for which I have been pleading; and they are as deaf to the opportunity as the deaf mute at the oratorio; and I say, "The pity of it; the pity of it!"

This campaign is designed in some measure to cure all this, to turn this money into right channels, and to bring these youth into these institutions.



## DISCUSSION.

ERNEST DE WITT BURTON, PROFESSOR OF THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CHICAGO.

The practical question before us tonight in reference to this campaign is whether we propose to throw ourselves with that energy and persistence into the campaign which will make it successful. In this day of multiple movements and campaigns that question must again and again come home to us: is it worth while for us to join this new movement, to enter into this new campaign? I am glad to have the privilege of seconding Doctor Nicholson's address because I agree so heartily with that which he has said and because I believe so thoroughly in the wisdom of this campaign, though it be one more added to a long list. And I do not know what I can do better than to give,—though it will be only a repetition in small part of what Dr. Nicholson has said—the reasons for the faith that is in me.

I believe in the undertaking and prosecution of this campaign, in the first place, because I believe in the principles that underlie it. Those two principles, as stated by Dr. Nicholson in his address, are these: that religion is an essential element of education and that education is an essential agency for the promotion of religion.

Now, there are a great many people in this country who do not accept either one of those propositions. There are a great many, of course, who do not believe in education at all and who do not believe in religion at all, but there are many who believe in religion but do not believe in education and there are many who believe in education but do not believe in religion. And it is to these latter classes that we are especially addressing our campaign. There are, for example, many parents, men of business, men of influence in the community who believe



in education but do not believe that religion is an essential part of education. The whole environment of many of our younger people is such as not to give them any faith in the need of religion as an element of education, and they are drifting, therefore, into institutions where they are receiving a certain type of education but where they are subject to no pronounced religious influence. That way lies, as Doctor Nicholson has so well shown, danger for our nation, a danger which if realized would result in the destruction of the ideals of the people and the failure of our national life. Therefore, I believe it of pre-eminent importance that there shall be an organized movement which shall bring home to this nation the conviction that religion is an essential part of education and that no man is really and truly educated whose religious nature has not received its due share of culture. On the other hand, there are a good many people who believe in religion but who do not believe in education in any broad sense of the term. I know this because I am meeting such people constantly in the communion to which I belong—men who are devoted to religion but have no sense of the fact that the man who is to be an effective force in promoting religion must himself be a man of trained intellectual and of educated powers. For this great class of this community we need this campaign to bring home the conviction that education is an essential for the effective promotion of religion.

Then, I believe in this campaign in the second place because I believe in that type of education for which the American college stands. I am in favor of all possible economy in education. I would like to save, as some of our educators believe they can by proper economy save, two years of the life of every young man and woman who receives an education. I do not want to waste time, but I do want that we shall maintain in this country such a type of education as will give us finally that type of American men and women which we have produced in the past. And I do not believe that we can achieve this

result by eliminating that type of education for which the American college stands. I know, as Doctor Nicholson has pointed out, how strong the tendency is in that direction. I know of hundreds and thousands and tens of thousands of young men who are going to have the kind of education that simply fits them for their occupation. The current in that direction is so strong that you cannot resist it. But just because it is strong, I believe we must stand with all our strength for a different type of education, in order that alongside of the men who get this, which I believe must be a narrow type of education, there shall be raised up the men and women who, educated in a broader way, will be fit to take the places of large responsibility in life.

There is in existence in this country a so-called Board of Missionary Preparation which has been working quietly for the last four or five years, in my judgment, very effectively. The result of the work of the Board of Missionary Preparation, as it has studied the problem abroad and at home, has been to lay emphasis on this fact, that we must send to the foreign field, to China, India, and even Africa, men who have received a broader education than many of those that we have been sending in the past. The fact is that the tendency in that direction is so strong that even some of them who believe in the things I am standing for have put on the brakes and said, "No, you must give a man a few years to do his work. You mustn't make him spend all of his life in preparation for his work." But, this at least is clear, that we must expect to send in the next few years a large number of men whose training has included the academy, the full college course, and four or five years of additional preparation for the work to which they are going.

Now, gentlemen, is the intellectual life of those oriental countries so much ahead of the intellectual life of this country that we must provide this sort of training for the men that we send abroad and yet look for the

leaders of our own country among those who shall have received an education three or four years shorter than this which we require of the foreign missionary? My conviction is that if we should study the problem at home as carefully as the Board of Missionary Preparation is studying it abroad, we should reach the same result that the Board of Missionary Preparation is reaching in reference to the foreign field. Therefore, I believe in the institution of a campaign which shall insist upon the perpetuation for the American student of that type of higher education which has hitherto given us our strongest men, improved as much as you can improve it.

In the third place I believe in this movement because it is a union movement. Our problems have come to be the same. The facts that we are going to present to the educated men and the educators of this country are largely the same. What is found to be true of the Methodist denomination will be found to be true of the other denominations. Why should we set up seventeen different movements to accomplish the same result in seventeen different groups by means of very largely the same facts? Surely there is bound to be immense economy in our massing our forces to attack the whole of American life together.

Then I believe in this movement because it is going to be based on facts. The time for eloquent speech based upon something else than facts has gone by. To whatever cause you may attribute it, whether it be to the hard-headed business men or whatever it may be, the fact has come to be that you cannot move American audiences by anything else than facts. Dr. Nicholson has given you today an illustration of the kind of investigation on which this campaign is to be based. I believe it is to be a campaign of eloquence because based on facts. And lastly, Mr. President, I believe in this campaign, because upon the success of it depends in the long run the success of practically all our other work. Without it, without the rousing of this country to the need

of such education as we have been here speaking of, without the conversion, let us say, of our American public to the belief in education in which there is an essential element of religion; without the conversion of our American college to this belief, how are we going to find the men who are to be leaders of our Christian forces? Where are we to find the men to send abroad to lead other peoples out into the freedom and strength and power of the Christian religion? Where are we to find the men to be the presidents of our colleges and the inspiration of our youth? Where are we to find the men who shall be the leaders of our home missionary enterprises? Where are we to find the men who are to be the molders of our public opinion unless we can accomplish that which this campaign is intended to promote? The success of this movement must, so far as I can see, promote all the great enterprises of the Christian church in this country.

---

### THE EFFICIENT COLLEGE

(Continuation of a report submitted at the meeting in Chicago, January, 1915.)

CALVIN H. FRENCH, ASSOCIATE SECRETARY COLLEGE  
BOARD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF  
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

**B**EGUN by a committee appointed by the council of Church Boards of Education, presented to the newly organized Association of American Colleges at its initial meeting in Chicago, in January 1915, and by the Association ordered revised and presented at its second meeting, this paper has become an effort to describe an efficient college. The committee as originally appointed consisted of Professor Ernest D. Burton, D. D., of Chicago University and Rev. Calvin H. French, D. D., of the College Board of the Presbyterian Church. The method adopted for the discussion was suggested

by Dr. Burton. When the paper was transferred from the Council of Church Boards to the Association of American Colleges, the second member of the committee was appointed to present it and, subsequently, to revise it. In this revision, however, Dr. Burton has given valuable suggestion and help which is gratefully acknowledged.

What are the things which go to the making of an efficient college and why are they needed? Manifestly, some of the things which make for the efficiency of a college cannot be reduced to statistics, however sanctified the statistician. History, tradition, ideals, great personalities are all of the essential substance of college efficiency, but they may not be reduced to percentages or presented in tabular form. Moreover, these moral and spiritual elements which are the life of the college require certain very material things for their support. The need for these material things grows more urgent with every passing year. Without forgetting the soul of the college, this paper therefore attempts to describe its body in terms of students, faculties, buildings, equipment, endowments. Perhaps the drift of the inquiry is most succinctly indicated by the question: "How much money is required in this beginning of the Twentieth Century to make an efficient college?"

There are very many who would welcome an answer to this question. If a clear and well reasoned answer can be given, perhaps a considerable number of American colleges would be willing to give up a hopeless struggle. Perhaps others seeing what they needed and why, may so barb their requests with reasons as to pierce the armor of many a philanthropist. Many Church Boards of Education and many giving agencies, as well as every friend of higher education, will welcome a specific statement of what a Twentieth Century College needs and why it needs it.

The  
Method

For the purpose in view, it has seemed best to describe first a theoretic institu-



tion which will be called a "Minimum College." The college so described is reduced to its own lowest terms of faculty, curriculum, equipment and endowment. In such an institution, the faculty and equipment are worked at their maximum capacity, and the result is the minimum of what a fair appraisal could accept as college work. Theoretically, such an institution would give a legitimate and honest college course at a minimum of cost for operation. This would be done, however, at the expense of the certain and rapid exhaustion both of faculty and equipment. Moreover, acceptable results could be obtained in such a college only when every element and condition was theoretically perfect. This would never occur in actual experience. The conclusion, therefore, is that an actual college, in order to do acceptable work must have more rather than less equipment, endowment and teaching force than the following description of the "Minimum College" indicates.

Beside the picture of the "Minimum College" will be placed another showing in a similar way a college which is theoretically "efficient;" that is, one which has teaching force, equipment and endowment which will enable it to do well all that a college ought to do.

Similar pictures of five actual colleges will be given. These colleges will be referred to by numbers. Of the institutions selected as illustrations, College No. 1 is a well known eastern institution. It has had time and money enough to enable it to develop its organization with reference to the educational needs and opportunities of its region. It may, therefore, be considered as representing the present educational views as to what the efficient college should be. Itemized information from this college is not available. The data presented, however, especially the summary statements as to income and expenditure taken from the published report of its treasurer, are sufficient to confirm the conclusions reached through the study of other colleges.



College No. 2 is a typical institution in the East. It is a good representative of the older colleges, and its statistics are illustrative of the best development of the American college.

College No. 3 is a well known institution in the north-central section. It has a shorter history and it is in a newer region, but, as related to its environment, it is much like colleges Nos. 1 and 2.

The two remaining colleges are in the Northwest. College No. 4 is the older and more fully developed, but both are growing along the best educational and financial lines. College No. 5 operates a preparatory department the statistics for which are merged with its college data.

The purpose of the discussion being to deal only with courses leading to baccalaureate degrees, all statistics accounting for affiliated courses or departments such as music, Normal Training, or Commercial Courses are eliminated.

**Tables  
and Notes.**

Both the theories and the facts under consideration will be presented in the following tables. Tables 1 and 2 with the accompanying notes will present in detail the curriculum and the faculty assignments in the "Minimum College."

Tables 3 and 4 will present corresponding data for the "Minimum College," the "Efficient College," and the five actual colleges. The five actual colleges will be referred to by numbers. The data will be arranged in seven perpendicular columns, the corresponding items for each college being in the same horizontal line. Tables 5 and 9, inclusive, will present some interesting facts gathered from reports sent from fifty-two colleges. It will be found upon examination that these facts corroborate the conclusions reached by the partially theoretic discussion in the earlier part of the paper. Such points as seem to require a more particular presentation will be discussed in the explanatory notes following the tables.

**TABLE 1. A MINIMUM CURRICULUM  
REQUIRED FOR MATRICULATION—Latin,**

Greek, German or French, 4 years, being two years of any two, or 4 years of any one submitted; Mathematics, 2 years; English, 3 years; History, 2 years; Elementary Science, 2 years; other subjects 2 years, a "year" being equivalent to a "Carnegie unit."

FRESHMAN	SOPHOMORE	JUNIOR	SENIOR
Latin or Greek	Latin or Greek or German or French	German or French 1 or French 11	German French 3
Math.	Mathematics Half Yr. 4 History Half Yr. 4	Physics 3 Bible 2	Geology 3 Bible 2
English	English	Psychology Half Yr. 4 Education Half Yr. 4	His of Phil. Half Yr. 4 Metaphysics Half Yr. 4
History	Chemistry	Biology	Economics Half Yr. 4 Sociology Half Yr. 4
Hours per week			
16	16	16	16

Note 1. For an explanation of the alternatives offered in Language and a certain amount of flexibility obtainable in this curriculum, see Explanatory Note 1.

Note 2. The minimum amount of Bible Study is shown rather than its distribution in the curriculum. If, in order to keep the number of hours per week at 16 for each student, it is found necessary to offer the work in Bible Study only in the Junior and Senior years as above, the need for such work in the Freshman and Sophomore years will be supplied by Y. M. C. A. or other voluntary classes.

Note 3. In each case where two related half year courses are grouped it is intended that one course shall be given during the first semester and the other during the second semester.

TABLE II. A MINIMUM FACULTY

PRESIDENT: All his time given to administration and promotion.

Professor:	Mathematics,	6 hours per week
	Physics,	3 hours per week
	Other assignments,	6 hours per week
Professor:	Chemistry,	4 hours per week
	Biology,	4 hours per week
	Geology,	3 hours per week
	Other assignments,	4 hours per week
Professor:	French,	7 hours per week
	German,	3 hours per week
	Other assignments,	5 hours per week
Professor:	Psychology,	4
	Education	4 4 hours per week
	Philosophy,	4 hours per week
	Other assignments,	7 hours per week
Professor:	Latin,	4 hours per week
	Bible,	4 hours per week
	Other assignments,	7 hours per week
Professor:	History,	6 hours per week
	Economics,	4
	Sociology,	4 4 hours per week
	Other assignmentst	5 hours per week
Professor:	English,	8 hours per week
	Other assignments,	7 hours per week

Note 1. The hours here assigned are on the basis of rigid requirements. The French and German assignments, for example, assume that a student presents two years of German but no French for matriculation. For a statement as to some slight possible variation from these assignments, see Explanatory Note 1.

Note 2. The number of the faculty is determined by the possible combination of subjects or departments, and, in view of our purpose to keep operating expenses at the minimum, it cannot be increased. See Explanatory Notes 1 and 2.

Note 3. The number of students who can be cared for by this faculty is approximately one hundred, or a number, which will require few, if any, divisions of classes. We are assuming that the number in any class, to get the best results, should not exceed an average of twenty-five. See Explanatory Note 3.

Note 4. The courses in Philosophy and Education, History and Economics are one-half year courses of four periods each per week.

Note 5. For an explanation of the "other assignments" in-

serted to make teaching schedules of fifteen hours per week, see Explanatory Note 1.

### A COMPARISON OF COLLEGES

**Introductory** The analysis of a college reveals two groups of facts, namely, those relating to its organization and those relating to its finances. Within each of these two main groups, there are three identical subdivisions of facts; namely, those having to do with administration, instruction and maintenance.

In accordance with this analysis, tables 3 and 4 will present parallel pictures or descriptions of the minimum and the efficient colleges, and beside them similar pictures of five actual colleges. Table 3 will give a picture of college organization, and table 4 will give a picture of college finances. The statistics for College No. 1 are for the school year ending in 1914. For the other "Actual Colleges" the statistics are for the year ending in 1915.

TABLE III. COLLEGE ORGANIZATION

	THEORETIC		ACTUAL				
	Min- imum.	Effici- ent.	No. 1	No. 2	No. 3	No. 4	No. 5
Students Col.....	100	400	420	429	435	244	112
Acad.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Faculty.....	8	32	51	39	40	24	15
ADMINISTRATION							
President.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dean.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Dean of Women.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Treasurer.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Librarian.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Prin. of Academy.....	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Registrar.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Registrar Asst.....	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Supt. of Buildings.....	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Sec. to President.....	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Sec. to Deans.....	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Sec. to Treasurer.....	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Asst. Librarian.....	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Asst. Librarian.....	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Stenographers.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	One
INSTRUCTION							
Log. Met.	Prof.	Prof.	Prof.	Prof.	Prof.	Prof.	Prof.
Psych. Ed.		Assoc. Prof.		Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Asst.		Inst.

## AMERICAN COLLEGES

67

Mathematics (& Phys.)	Prof.	Prof. Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Prof. Asst. Asst.	Prof. Asst. Inst. Inst. Inst.	Prof. Prof. Inst. *Inst.	Prof. Inst.	Prof.
Physics:	No	Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Assoc. Asst.	Prof. Asst.	Asst.	Prof.	Prof.
Chemistry: (& Biol. & Geol.)	Prof.	Prof. Prof.	Prof. Prof. Inst.	Prof. Inst. Inst.	Prof. Asst.	Asst. Inst.	Prof.
Biology:	No	Prof. Prof.	Prof. Prof. Asst. Instr.	Prof. Inst.	Prof. Asst. Inst.	Prof. Asst.	Prof.
Mineralogy: Geology:	No	Prof.	Prof. Inst.	No	No	No	No
Latin: (& Bible)	Prof.	Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Asst. Asst.	Prof.	Prof. Prof. Prof.	Prof.	Prof.
Bible	No.	Prof.	Prof.	No.	Prof. Prof.	Prof.	Prof.
History: (& Economics)	Prof.	Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Assoc. Fellow	Prof. Inst.	No Asst.	Prof. Asst. Inst.	Prof.
Economics:	No	Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Assoc.	Asst.	Prof.	No.	No
German (& French)	Prof.	Prof. Prof.	Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Asst. Inst. Inst.	Prof. Inst.	Prof. Prof.	Prof. Inst.
Romance Lang.	No	Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Assoc. Assoc. Inst.	Prof. Inst. Inst.	Prof.	Inst.	Inst.
English	Prof.	Prof. Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Assoc. Assoc. Asst.	Prof. Asst. Inst. Inst.	Prof. Asst. Inst.	Prof. Inst.	Prof. Inst.
Astrom. & Nav.	No	No	Prof.	No	No	No	No
Govt. & Int. Law,	No	No Prof.	Prof.	Prof.	No	No	No
Greek	No	No	Prof. Assoc.	Prof. Asst.	No	No	Prof.
Music:	No	No	Prof.	No	Prof. Prof. Inst. Inst.	No	No



## ASSOCIATION OF

Hygiene & Phys. Ed.	No	Prof.	Prof.	Prof.	Asst.	Inst.	No
Athletics		Assoc.	Assoc.		Asst.		
			Assoc.		Inst.		
			Sec.		Inst.		
Pub. Speaking:	No	Prof.	Assoc.	Prof.	Asst.	No	Prof.
		Assoc.			Inst.		
Engineering:	No	No	No	Prof.	No	No	No
				Prof.			
				Prof.			
				Prof.			
				Asst.			
				Asst.			
				Asst.			
				Inst.			
				Inst.			
Sociology:	No	Assoc.	No	Asst.	Asst.	No	No
*Half time.							

Note 1. In College No. 1 and College No. 5 the president teaches some classes in Metaphysics, Psychology and Education.

Note 2. Music taught in these courses is not Music as an accomplishment, but such study of the history or theory of Music as may properly be allowed for credit towards a degree.

Note 3. The designations of subjects in the brackets refer only to the minimum college, and they call attention to the combinations of teaching positions in that college.

Note 4. In college No. 2 some instructors teach in two departments.

## MAINTENANCE

Head Janitors.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Asst. Janitors.....	No	Yes	Yes	Seven	Three	Three	One
Engineer.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firemen.....	No	Two	Yes	Two	Two	Two	One
Matron.....	One	Two	*One	No	One	One	One
Financial Sec.....	No	No	No	No	No	One	No
Other Employees.....	No	No	One	Five	Yes	No	No
*At Hospital.							

Note:—Many colleges employ field men to seek for money or students. In special campaigns, financial secretaries are temporarily employed by some colleges.

## TABLE 4. COLLEGE FINANCES

## A. OPERATING EXPENSES

Note:—In the two parts of this table, namely "ADMINISTRATION" and "MAINTENANCE," a zero means that, so far as available information indicates, the position is not filled, or the item of expense is not incurred. A blank ( . . . . ) means that the position may be filled, or the expense incurred, but the



amount of the expenditure is not reported. In this case the amount of the expenditure may be included in some general item. In every case the total as given is inclusive.

## ADMINISTRATION

	THEORETIC			ACTUAL				
	Minimum.	Efficient.	No. 1.	No. 2.	No. 3.	No. 4.	No. 5.	
President .....	\$2,500	\$5,000	.....	\$5,000	\$4,800	\$2,500	\$2,500	
Dean .....	0	0	.....	1,000	†	†	0	
Dean of Women .....	0	500	.....	0	†	†	500	
Treasurer .....	0	2,500	.....	2,250	2,000	0	1,500	
Librarian .....	0	2,500	*7,163	1,200	1,050	1,045	1,000	
Asst. Librarian .....	500	600	.....	555	350	693	.....	
Asst. Librarian .....	0	600	.....	720	0	0	0	
Asst. Librarian .....	0	0	.....	0	0	0	0	
Registrar .....	0	500	.....	0	.....	0	100	
Supt. of Bldgs. ....	0	1,500	.....	0	.....	0	0	
Asst. to Pres....	0	1,500	.....	0	.....	0	0	
Sec. to Deans....	0	1,000	.....	600	.....	0	0	
Sec. to Pres....	0	825	.....	750	.....	0	0	
Sec. to Treas....	0	0	.....	600	.....	0	0	
Stenographers....	825	1,650	.....	1,000	1,137	1,620	750	
Totals .....	\$3,825	19,175	25,333	13,675	9,337	5,858	6,225	

\*Includes salaries of Assistants.

†Salaries included in salaries for "Instruction."

## INSTRUCTION

Logic, Metaph. ....	\$1,500	\$2,500	-----	\$2,000	*\$3,000	\$1,045	(Pres.)
Psych. Ed. ....		1,500	-----		2,250		
			-----		1,500		
Mathematics .....	1,500	2,500	-----	2,250	2,000	1,500	\$1,000
(& Phys.) .....		2,500	-----	1,500	1,800		
		1,500	-----	1,200	1,200		
			-----	1,000	1,900		
			-----	500			
Physics .....	0	2,500	-----	2,100	1,400	1,600	1,200
		1,500	-----			150	
Chemistry .....	1,500	2,500	-----	2,000	2,000	1,600	1,000
(& Biol. & Geol.) .....		2,500	-----	1,250	1,600	250	
			-----	400			
Biology .....	0	2,500	-----	2,000	1,700	1,600	1,500
		2,500	-----	500	1,200	200	
Mineralogy .....	0	2,500	-----	0	0	0	0
Geology .....			-----				
Latin .....	1,500	2,500	-----	2,300	2,500	1,500	1,000
Bible .....		1,500	-----		1,800	700	900
			-----		1,250		
Bible .....	0	2,500	-----	0	2,250	0	1,500
			-----		2,000		
History .....	1,500	2,500	-----	2,000	1,500	1,600	1,500
(& Economics) .....		1,500	-----	400			600

## ASSOCIATION OF

Economics	0	2,500	1,600	1,900	1,500	0
		1,500				
German	1,500	2,500	2,000	2,000	1,600	1,100
(& French)		1,500	1,700	1,300	600	
			1,200			
Romance Lang.	0	2,500	1,600	1,400	1,600	1,000
		1,500	1,200		600	
English	1,500	2,500	2,000	2,300	1,600	1,200
		2,500	1,700	1,600	1,600	
		1,500		1,000		
				400		
Astrom. & Nav.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Govt. & Int. Law	0	2,000	0	0	0	0
Greek	0	2,500	2,000		1,500	1,500
Music	0	0	0	3,000	1,800	0
				2,300		
				1,200		
				362		
Hygiene & Phys.	0	2,500	2,000	1,600	1,500	700
Ed. Athletics		1,500		1,550		
				1,300		
				600		
Comp. Anatomy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pub. Speaking	0	2,500	2,000	1,600	0	1,200
		1,500		400		
Engineering	0	0	2,500	0	0	0
			3,000			
			2,000			
			1,600			
			2,000			
			1,600			
			1,500			
			1,300			
			1,500			
Sociology	0	1,500	0	1,600	0	0
Other Subjects	0	0	0	7,979	0	0
Totals	\$10,500	70,000	117,167	65,379	60,862	25,645
					16,900	

\*includes salary as dean.

## MAINTENANCE

<i>Employees</i>						
Head Janitor	900	1,500	0	720	1,020	1,000
Asst. Janitors	450	3,000	3,480	2,040	1,500	360
Engineer	900	1,500	0	1,020	850	700
Fireman	0	1,500	1,920	1,200		600
Matron	500	1,000	0	1,200		250
Field Agent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other employees	500	2,000	4,000	500	3,600	1,500

# AMERICAN COLLEGES

71

## Other Expenses

Fuel, Lights .....	1,500	4,000	10,877	12,294	5,187	2,343	2,958
Ptg. Adv. Post.....	750	2,500	5,227	896	2,927	1,583	4,469
Repairs .....	1,000	3,000	-----	3,000	8,931	2,087	2,817
Misc. Supplies .....	500	1,000	-----	1,500	1,115	0	910
Gen. Equipment .....	-----	500	-----	2,500	2,550	8,260	508
Laboratories .....	500	2,500	6,055	5,000	3,825	2,420	1,044
Library .....	500	2,500	7,640	1,400	1,182	2,097	523
Travel, etc .....	1,000	1,000	1,960	100	767	158	1,051
Improvements .....	0	1,000	-----	2,100	0	0	0
Insurance .....	100	500	-----	776	738	372	66
Gen. Expense .....	500	10,000	69,875	18,467	11,527	12,602	8,562
Totals .....	\$9,600	39,000	111,634	57,433	45,429	38,891	25,548

## SUMMARY OF OPERATING EXPENSES

Administ'n \$	3,825	19,175	25,333	13,675	9,337	5,858	6,350
Instruction ..	10,500	70,000	117,167	65,379	60,862	25,645	16,900
Maintenance..	9,600	39,000	111,634	57,433	45,429	38,891	25,548
Totals .....	\$23,925	128,175	254,134	136,487	115,628	70,394	48,798

## B. INCOME

Student Fees\$	5,000	20,000	60,713	70,738	38,006	18,657	14,092
Room Rents..	1,500	5,000	6,536	6,590	10,458	2,424	1,919
Donations ..	2,500	0	7,627	873	7,416	5,245	5,487
Endowment ..	14,925	103,175	138,985	49,350	46,532	30,382	27,300
Grants .....	0	0	8,999	0	0	0	0
Other Sources	0	0	1,963	8,936	5,316	6,042	0
Deficit .....	0	0	29,311	0	7,900	7,635	0
Totals .....	\$23,952	128,175	254,134	136,487	115,628	70,394	48,798

## C. PROPERTY

### BUILDINGS, CAMPUS AND EQUIPMENT

Main Bldg. ....	\$100,000	150,000	60,000	-----	27,076	50,000	123,453
Recitations .....	0	0	35,000	-----	12,555	8,000	0
Recitations .....	0	0	80,000	-----	2,500	0	0
Boys' Dorm.....	30,000	50,000	30,000	-----	10,000	6,000	0
Boys' Dorm.....	0	50,000	30,000	-----	0	0	0
Boys' Dorm.....	0	0	150,000	-----	0	0	0
Girls' Dorm.....	30,000	50,000	0	-----	84,844	26,941	27,911
Girls' Dorm.....	0	50,000	0	-----	2,500	7,500	0
Girls' Dorm.....	0	0	0	-----	1,000	0	0
Gymnasium .....	15,000	75,000	120,000	-----	58,969	22,500	0
Heating Plant..	10,000	50,000	0	-----	50,285	0	32,323
Library .....	0	100,000	60,000	-----	25,000	0	0
Laboratory .....	0	75,000	90,000	-----	57,372	34,830	0
Laboratory .....	0	75,000	90,000	-----	0	0	0
Laboratory .....	0	75,000	0	-----	0	0	0
Chapel .....	0	75,000	60,000	-----	75,450	0	0
Observatory .....	0	0	30,000	-----	29,436	0	0
Commons .....	0	30,000	0	-----	0	0	0
Pres. House.....	0	15,000	15,400	-----	0	14,560	0
Music Hall .....	0	0	0	-----	47,889	52,064	0
Grand Stand .....	0	0	11,000	-----	11,855	0	0
Other Buildings..	0	0	129,400	-----	0	600	2,400
Campus .....	10,000	50,000	84,331	-----	100,440	86,374	50,850
Equipment .....	5,000	50,000	188,000	-----	111,030	110,007	20,100
Totals .....	\$200,000	1,020,000	1,262,731	827,500	708,201	419,376	256,037

ENDOWMENT						
\$300,000	\$2,093,400	\$2,689,352	\$961,812	\$852,570	\$507,337	\$465,087
TOTAL ASSETS						
\$500,000	3,113,400	3,952,083	1,788,812	1,560,771	926,713	721,124

Note: For the "Minimum" and "Efficient" colleges, the endowment is the income from this source as indicated above capitalized at five per cent.; for the other colleges it is the amount actually reported in each case.

### INTRODUCTORY NOTES ON TABLES 5 TO 9

**General** In accordance with instructions given by this Association at its meeting in January, 1915, blanks providing for the reporting of such information as is indicated by the preceding tables were sent early in the summer to the one hundred and sixty-two institutions composing the membership of the Association. Only a few returns had been received in September. A letter was then written to the colleges from which no reports had been received, and, in the end, fifty two reports were obtained, two of them being received after the first of the present month.

The five following tables have been compiled from these fifty-two reports. It is hoped that the headings of the tables and the grouping of the figures will sufficiently indicate the nature and the meaning of each table without other explanation. Attention is called, however, to the following particulars:

Four colleges, Nos. 17, 34, 38 and 51, were unwilling that the data furnished should be made public. College No. 39 was not ready to have its financial statistics used until a later time. Blanks appear, therefore, opposite the numbers assigned to these institutions in the tables of financial statistics.

The placing of the colleges in the list was determined by the amount of productive endowment reported. The larger the endowment, the higher is the place of the college in the list.

College No. 2 is a part of a large university. The college budget could not be satisfactorily segregated. For this reason financial statistics for this institution do not appear. "College No. 1," as is evident, is a large university. Its statistics being returned, and in very clear form, are

included for the interesting light which they throw upon the tables as a whole. College No. 10 is operated by a religious order. Its faculty receive no salaries.

TABLE 5—The asterisk (\*) following the number of students as given in this table indicates the colleges which operate preparatory departments the statistics for which are combined with the college statistics.

TABLE 6—The salary assigned in this table to the president of college No. 4 is two-thirds of his whole salary, the balance being considered as paid on account of his administration of other parts of his institution. The free use of a residence in addition to the stated salary is indicated by "H."

TABLE 7—The (\*) in this table indicates items in which tuitions and room rents are combined. The dagger (†) indicates items which combine payments for boarding and room rents. The information furnished did not permit the separation of these different kinds of payments.

TABLE 9—In this table an item of \$172,698 is reported as "unproductive endowment" for college No. 14. The college described this item as "partially productive" but did not indicate how much of it might be productive.

TABLE 5: STUDENTS AND FACULTY

	Students.	Faculty.	Students per Teacher.	Pro- fessors.	Asso- ciates.	Assist- ants.	Instruc- tors.	Others.
1.	2062	209	9.87	48	25	36	32	68
2.	649	63	10.30	24	0	6	33	0
3.	179	25	7.16	16	3	4	0	2
4.	1000	68	14.70	27	3	14	11	13
5.	568	47	12.09	22	4	6	6	9
6.	139	24	5.79	13	0	7	4	0
7.	1025*	54	18.98	19	5	7	17	6
8.	504*	32	15.75	17	11	9	8	3
9.	429	39	11.00	18	0	11	10	0
10.	520*	30	17.33	18	0	1	11	0
11.	580	35	16.57	21	1	2	11	0
12.	457	29	15.76	17	1	0	6	5
13.	314	21	14.95	16	0	1	0	4
14.	595	41	14.51	21	5	0	15	0
15.	435	40	10.85	15	0	10	10	5
16.	206	19	10.84	13	2	3	0	1
17.	291	31	9.39	16	1	0	14	0
18.	475	33	14.39	20	5	8	0	0
19.	244	24	10.17	17	2	4	1	0



## ASSOCIATION OF

	Students.	Faculty.	Students per Teacher.	Pro- fessors.	Asso- ciates.	Assist- ants.	Instruc- tors.	Others.
20.	420	31	13.55	19	0	2	10	0
21.	181*	16	11.34	10	0	1	5	0
23.	354	22	16.09	12	0	4	5	1
23.	346*	45	7.69	21	0	23	1	0
24.	134	24	5.58	19	0	0	5	0
25.	200*	14	14.29	9	0	1	4	0
26.	610	48	12.71	17	8	0	19	4
27.	412	23	17.90	14	0	3	6	0
28.	255	27	9.44	14	7	6	0	0
29.	214	14	15.28	13	0	1	0	0
30.	165	12	13.75	8	3	0	1	0
31.	320	13	24.62	12	0	0	1	0
32.	488	34	14.35	18	0	16	0	0
33.	305	13	23.46	11	0	1	1	0
34.	327*	18	18.17	11	0	2	5	0
35.	165*	15	11.00	10	0	2	3	0
36.	279*	16	17.44	13	0	0	3	0
37.	294*	16	18.12	15	0	0	1	0
38.	332*	45	7.38	8	0	1	30	6
39.	304*	21	14.48	10	0	0	11	0
40.	210*	17	12.4	7	0	3	7	0
41.	242	28	8.64	16	0	0	12	0
42.	152*	15	10.13	12	0	0	3	0
43.	172*	19	9.05	16	0	0	3	0
44.	260*	18	14.44	14	0	0	4	0
45.	156*	16	9.75	10	0	0	6	0
46.	87*	16	5.44	9	0	0	7	0
47.	122	11	11.09	7	0	1	3	0
48.	100*	14	7.14	8	0	0	6	0
49.	132*	18	7.33	11	0	0	7	0
50.	193*	13	14.85	9	0	0	4	0
51.	150*	24	6.25	16	0	0	8	0
52.	261*	39	6.69	22	0	10	7	0

TABLE 6: SALARIES

	President.	Professor.	Associate Professor.	Assistant Professor.	Instructor.
1.	\$12,000	\$4,000	\$3,000	\$2,000	\$1,000
2.	-----	2,100	None	1,500	1,350
3.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
4.	4,000	2,200	1,800	1,500	1,000
5.	4,800H	2,250	1,600	1,300	800
6.	4,000H	2,500	None	1,500	500
7.	4,000H	2,000	1,700	1,400	1,100
8.	3,300	2,250	1,500	850	None
9.	5,000	2,300	None	1,700	1,250
10.	0	0	0	0	0
11.	4,000	2,300	1,800	1,200	1,000
12.	3,000	2,000	1,000	None	1,100
13.	-----	2,000	None	1,000	600
14.	-----	1,600	1,200	None	600
15.	4,800	2,300	None	1,600	1,250
16.	4,800	2,000	1,600	600	150
17.	3,000	1,400	1,100	None	300
18.	5,000H	2,000	-----	-----	-----



# AMERICAN COLLEGES

75

	President.	Professor.	Associate Professor.	Assistant Professor.	Instructor.
19.	2,500	1,600	1,600	1,200	250
20.	3,300	1,800	None	1,200	1,100
21.	2,500	1,500	None	1,000	1,000
22.	3,000	2,000	None	1,200	1,000
23.	2,500	1,500	None	1,000	-----
24.	3,000	2,200	None	None	1,100
25.	2,600	1,500	None	1,000	800
26.	3,600H	2,000	None	1,300	800
27.	3,000	2,000	None	900	350
28.	5,000	1,250	1,150	1,000	None
29.	3,000	1,200	None	400	208
30.	2,500	1,400	900	None	-----
31.	3,000	2,000	None	None	300
32.	2,000	1,500	None	1,300	None
33.	2,000	1,300	None	780	230
34.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
35.	3,000H	1,500	None	750	300
36.	2,500	1,500	None	None	-----
37.	3,000	1,500	None	None	900
38.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
39.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
40.	2,000	1,200	None	1,000	500
41.	1,800	1,000	None	None	800
42.	3,000	1,200	None	None	675
43.	2,400	1,200	None	None	500
44.	3,500	1,200	-----	-----	-----
45.	2,000	1,100	None	None	None
46.	1,400	1,000	None	None	600
47.	1,800	1,100	None	-----	800
48.	2,000	1,200	None	None	450
49.	2,000	1,200	None	None	650
50.	1,800	1,000	None	None	-----
51.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
52.	1,200	Fees	Fees	Fees	Fees

TABLE 7: INCOME

	Student Fees.	Per cent.	Endow-ment Income.	Per cent.	Miscel. Special Deficit.	Per cent.	Room Rents.	Per cent.	Total.
1.	\$ 90,000	7.5	\$857,000	71.4	\$231,000	19.3	\$22,000	1.8	\$1,200,000
2.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
3.	*58,000	34.2	85,800	50.1	26,000	15.7	-----	-----	169,800
4.	104,394	56.6	61,138	33.1	18,238	9.9	635	.4	184,405
5.	66,489	36.0	57,462	31.1	58,020	31.4	2,891	1.5	184,862
6.	6,552	8.7	69,000	91.0	200	.3	0	.0	75,752
7.	68,928	54.9	43,463	34.6	8,665	6.9	4,539	3.6	125,595
8.	*24,885	32.6	50,129	65.9	965	1.5	0	0	75,979
9.	70,738	51.9	49,350	36.2	9,710	7.1	6,590	4.2	136,388
10.	5,000	.0	48,000	86.5	0	0	2,500	4.5	55,500
11.	30,906	34.3	42,553	47.2	986	1.1	15,685	17.4	90,130
12.	24,055	30.3	45,428	57.3	1,665	1.3	8,756	11.1	79,304
13.	21,436	28.6	43,520	58.0	6,049	8.1	3,995	5.3	75,000
14.	47,946	36.8	60,974	46.8	18,439	14.2	2,829	2.2	130,188
15.	38,006	32.9	46,532	40.2	20,632	17.8	10,458	9.1	115,628
16.	15,496	14.7	35,854	33.9	16,691	15.8	†37,530	35.6	105,571
17.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	46,447
18.	28,909	45.1	29,219	45.6	3,460	5.4	2,487	3.9	64,075
19.	18,657	26.5	30,382	43.2	18,930	26.9	2,424	3.4	70,393
20.	33,759	29.7	24,500	21.6	18,550	16.4	36,460	32.3	113,269
21.	14,092	28.9	27,300	55.7	5,487	11.0	1,919	4.4	48,798
22.	20,585	33.4	20,988	34.1	12,341	20.0	†7,645	12.5	61,559

	Student Fees.	Per cent.	Endowment Income.	Per cent.	Miscel. Special Deficit.	Per cent.	Room Rents.	Per cent.	Total.
23.	4,499	11.9	21,325	56.4	10,480	27.8	1,442	3.9	37,656
24.	8,100	15.3	21,386	40.5	21,300	40.4	2,000	3.8	52,786
25.	11,030	32.8	20,502	60.9	1,620	4.8	483	1.5	33,635
26.	60,909	33.0	17,561	9.5	0	0	106,024	57.5	184,494
27.	20,117	51.0	19,203	48.6	153	.4	0	0	39,475
28.	32,260	28.7	15,087	13.4	47,852	42.6	17,185	15.3	112,384
29.	14,073	36.4	16,845	43.5	5,746	14.8	2,046	5.3	35,710
30.	5,209	14.5	13,874	38.6	16,074	44.8	749	2.1	35,906
31.	21,000	41.9	16,870	33.6	545	1.1	11,750	23.4	50,165
32.	33,309	57.8	13,887	24.1	0	0	10,413	18.1	57,609
33.	7,618	24.5	15,526	50.0	6,641	21.4	1,266	4.1	31,051
34.									
35.	12,907	30.3	11,546	27.1	16,480	38.7	1,705	3.9	42,638
36.	14,154	42.0	14,182	42.1	5,353	15.9	0	0	33,689
37.	26,340	43.1	11,346	18.6	19,617	32.1	3,845	6.2	61,143
38.									
39.	6,427	25.5	11,304	44.9	6,354	25.2	1,091	4.4	25,176
40.	11,144	32.5	10,720	31.3	9,930	28.9	2,488	7.3	34,280
41.	29,610	32.1	9,385	10.2	1,465	1.6	51,729	56.1	92,189
42.	9,812	39.8	11,145	45.2	2,084	8.3	1,606	6.7	24,647
43.	5,490	19.2	9,199	32.2	11,564	40.4	2,344	8.2	28,597
44.	12,300	29.5	8,000	19.1	18,450	44.2	3,000	7.2	41,750
45.	9,994	25.2	7,630	19.2	14,063	35.5	7,909	20.1	39,596
46.	4,534	29.2	8,543	54.9	2,353	15.1	113	.8	15,543
47.	6,403	27.3	6,935	29.1	9,076	38.8	1,000	4.8	23,414
48.									
49.	4,800	22.3	4,700	22.1	11,910	55.6	0	0	21,410
50.	10,189	45.7	3,515	15.7	8,604	38.6	0	0	22,308
51.									
52.	3,500	76.1	0	0	1,100	23.9	0	0	4,600

TABLE 8: THE BUDGET AND COST PER STUDENT

	Adminis- tration.	Per cent.	Instruc- tion.	Per cent.	Mainte- nance.	Per cent.	Total Budget.	Cost per Stu- dent.
	\$123,000	15.0	\$424,000	51.6	\$274,000	33.4	\$821,000	\$398
1.								
2.								
3.	9,900	12.7	56,000	71.9	12,000	15.4	77,900	435
4.	22,496	12.3	89,066	49.0	70,211	38.7	181,773	182
5.	19,514	10.6	84,195	45.5	81,153	43.9	184,862	324
6.	6,680	10.0	49,164	73.7	10,850	16.3	66,694	480
7.	17,326	14.3	68,576	56.5	35,493	29.2	121,395	119
8.	8,527	11.2	39,317	51.7	28,136	37.1	75,980	149
9.	13,675	10.0	65,379	47.9	57,433	42.1	136,487	318
10.					40,000			
11.	12,080	13.4	50,400	55.9	27,650	30.7	90,130	155
12.	8,772	11.1	43,561	58.7	27,021	30.2	79,354	173
13.	10,500	14.0	32,100	42.8	32,400	43.2	75,000	239
14.	8,903	6.8	47,289	26.3	73,996	56.9	130,188	129
15.	9,337	8.1	60,862	52.6	45,429	39.3	115,628	266
16.	9,800	9.3	32,700	31.0	63,071	59.7	105,571	512
17.							46,447	159
18.	7,980	12.5	48,495	75.7	7,600	11.8	64,075	135
19.	5,858	8.3	25,645	36.4	38,891	55.3	70,394	289
20.	7,842	6.9	36,653	32.4	68,776	60.7	113,271	270
21.	6,350	13.0	16,900	34.6	25,548	52.4	48,798	270
22.	6,870	11.2	29,470	47.9	25,220	40.9	61,560	174
23.	4,900	13.1	22,875	60.7	9,880	26.2	37,655	108
24.	7,469	14.4	25,750	49.8	18,488	35.8	51,707	386
25.	6,833	20.3	13,604	40.5	13,198	39.2	33,635	168
26.	28,740	16.6	58,953	34.1	85,378	49.3	173,071	284
27.	7,334	18.6	28,296	71.7	3,845	9.7	39,475	96
28.	11,435	10.5	29,250	26.9	68,040	62.6	108,712	426
29.	6,052	15.6	17,386	44.9	15,274	39.5	38,712	181
30.	1,927	5.3	10,680	29.7	23,299	65.0	35,906	217
31.	5,175	10.3	26,700	53.2	17,290	36.5	50,165	151
32.	6,776	14.5	35,316	75.2	4,840	10.3	46,932	96
33.	4,215	13.6	13,936	44.9	12,900	41.5	31,051	102
34.								
35.	3,000	11.4	12,523	47.4	10,870	41.2	26,393	160
36.	3,820	10.7	14,600	41.0	17,164	48.3	35,584	128
37.	4,750	12.8	28,306	77.6	3,587	9.6	37,143	126

	Adminis- tration.	Per cent.	Instruc- tion.	Per cent.	Mainte- nance.	Per cent.	Total Budget.	Cost per Stu- dent.
38.								
39.								
40.	4,567	13.3	14,048	40.9	15,667	45.8	34,282	163
41.	6,055	6.8	23,964	26.8	59,155	66.4	89,174	368
42.	3,360	13.6	12,680	51.4	8,606	35.0	24,646	162
43.	3,000	8.3	14,117	38.9	19,119	52.8	36,236	211
44.	6,248	14.9	16,900	38.3	19,502	46.8	41,750	161
45.	4,233	13.5	15,354	48.8	11,846	37.7	31,433	201
46.	1,311	8.4	10,053	64.9	4,149	26.7	15,543	179
47.	2,625	17.5	8,650	57.7	3,725	34.8	15,000	123
48.	2,000	14.5	10,760	78.2	1,006	7.3	13,766	138
49.	2,300	10.7	15,110	70.6	4,000	18.7	21,410	162
50.	5,151	22.9	10,600	47.3	6,656	29.8	22,407	116
51.								
52.								

TABLE 9. PLANT AND ENDOWMENT

	Buildings Grounds Equipment.	Per cent.	Productive Endowment.	Per cent.	Unproductive Endowment.	Productive Endowment and Plant.
	\$2,145,000	8.9	\$21,946,000	91.1		\$24,091,000
1.						
2.						
3.	2,190,000	52.5	1,984,000	47.5		4,174,000
4.	1,515,898	50.4	1,526,374	49.6		3,078,272
5.	624,836	32.0	1,325,918	68.0		1,950,754
6.	784,000	37.6	1,300,000	62.4		2,084,000
7.	834,105	44.6	1,038,174	55.4	\$501,280	1,872,279
8.	1,355,219	57.2	1,020,798	42.8		2,376,017
9.	827,500	46.3	961,313	53.7		1,788,813
10.	823,000	46.4	950,000	53.6		1,773,000
11.	566,283	38.2	916,284	61.8		1,483,567
12.	461,370	34.2	855,794	65.8	9,955	1,347,164
13.	566,708	39.1	881,396	60.9	19,500	1,448,104
14.	388,000	31.1	861,223	68.9	172,698	1,249,223
15.	708,201	45.4	852,570	54.6	18,867	1,560,771
16.	693,700	46.3	804,219	53.7	28,725	1,497,919
17.	522,500	49.4	535,102	50.6		1,057,602
18.	482,537	47.6	530,528	52.4		1,013,065
19.	419,377	45.2	507,337	54.8	204,618	926,714
20.	406,886	45.2	493,538	54.8		900,424
21.	256,037	35.5	465,087	64.5	55,413	721,124
22.	613,539	57.3	457,885	42.7	30,579	1,071,424
23.	262,600	36.5	457,300	63.5	11,500	719,900
24.	261,000	38.8	411,964	61.2		672,964
25.	319,290	45.1	388,187	54.9		707,477
26.	460,242	54.6	382,732	45.4		842,974
27.	269,424	41.8	375,105	58.2	23,920	644,529
28.	436,013	58.8	311,616	41.2		747,629
29.	265,494	46.9	300,520	53.1		566,014
30.	210,000	42.4	285,000	57.6		495,000
31.	349,074	55.7	280,591	44.3	3,000	632,666
32.	277,842	50.1	276,817	49.9	3,092	554,659
33.	175,732	38.9	276,069	61.1	37,027	451,801
34.	115,500	31.5	251,347	68.5	5,400	366,847
35.	236,167	49.9	236,676	50.1	2,500	472,843
36.	175,000	42.5	236,286	57.5	500	411,286
37.	305,965	57.7	225,000	42.3	25,000	530,965
38.						
39.	146,211	39.6	222,776	60.4	145,000	368,987
40.	299,570	58.8	209,560	41.2	5,000	509,130
41.	381,454	64.6	208,615	35.4	1,400	590,069
42.	271,043	59.8	182,000	40.2	7,060	453,043
43.	167,660	48.5	177,851	51.5		345,511
44.	225,000	56.8	171,000	43.2		396,000
45.	176,500	51.2	168,275	48.8	13,699	344,775
46.	74,426	35.0	138,016	65.0		212,442
47.	87,000	45.3	105,000	54.7	2,000	192,000
48.						
49.	125,000	59.5	85,000	40.5		210,000
50.	80,750	50.8	78,014	49.2	178,034	158,764
51.						
52.						

## EXPLANATORY NOTES

**Note 1.** The minimum curriculum must be judged with reference to its own object. That object is the mapping out of an acceptable course of college study which can be offered to a student at the minimum of cost. By its own definition it must be a rigid, almost inflexible course. The available class hours with a teaching force of seven indicate that about sixty per cent of the work must be required both as to kind and quantity. Since certain administrative work must also be done by the same seven teachers, the margin of flexibility will be still further reduced.

Within these limits the minimum college must select and group subjects, balancing one over against the other so that the results will be a satisfactory college course. Keeping within its self-imposed limits, the minimum curriculum must be taught by the minimum number of teachers. This number will be determined, first, by the possible grouping of college subjects, and, secondly, by the amount of work which each teacher can do. A careful inspection of the subjects which must be included in a college course seems to show that they cannot be reduced to fewer than seven groups. The minimum curriculum will therefore require the services of seven teachers. Experience shows that a teaching schedule of an average fifteen hours per week is about the limit of effective service in the classroom. Upon this plan, a teaching force of seven would carry a schedule of one hundred and five hours per week.

The specific assignments of work, as indicated for the minimum faculty, provide for only sixty hours of work, leaving forty-one hours for "other assignments." A part of these unassigned hours will be needed for certain administrative work such as that of the dean and the registrar. Such time as may be left after providing for this work may be used to provide for a limited amount of flexibility in the curriculum. A few altern-

atives in language may be offered. A little additional work in science may be given. A few classes may be heard in sections. All this must be done, however, within the limits of the available unassigned hours, and the teachers for the new subjects or classes must be found among the original teaching force of seven.

In this faculty no teaching is assigned to the president. By our definition, the minimum college is one which has the minimum of the things which a college needs. It is wearing out these things at the maximum rate. It must, therefore, be the chief business of the president both to make good for wear and tear and to build up his institution until it has reached a condition of permanent efficiency. This with his administrative duties, will fully occupy his time. As already indicated, the number of teachers is determined by the possible combinations of subjects or departments.

**Note 3.**  
**The Number**  
**of Students**

The number of students assigned to the minimum college is one hundred. This is about the number which will permit the accomplishment of the double object in view, namely, an acceptable degree of efficiency at a minimum of cost. College work consists, for the most part, of recitations rather than lectures. It cannot be well done if the classes are larger than twenty-five. It is assumed that the minimum college will have about the same number in each of the four classes, for, among the many things which this college does not provide for is any considerable degree of mortality between the Freshman and the succeeding classes. A total number of about one hundred students in the college would, therefore, put about twenty-five into each of the four classes. Except for the slight degree of election provided for above, there would be about twenty-five students in every recitation.

If it be asked, "How will this description fit the actual college which, with one hundred students, has forty



or fifty in the Freshman class and dwindling numbers in the upper classes?" the answer is, "It will not fit at all." Such a college, because of irregularities and because of divisions in the Freshman class and because of the necessity of maintaining an undiminished "overhead expense" for the upper classes, will greatly excel the minimum college in the proportions of its budget and will fall far short of it in efficiency.

In the efficient college most of the limitations imposed upon the minimum college disappear. The number of students assigned to this college is four hundred. This is not a number as rigidly fixed as is the number assigned to the minimum college. Opinions will vary with regard to the best size of a student group for college objects. A certain type of community life is to be developed. A certain relation between faculty and students is to be maintained. Certain practical matters of cost and educational economics will be taken into account. It is not the object of this paper to discuss any of the many important and interesting aspects of college life suggested by mention of these things. The simple fact is that colleges which seem most illustrative and typical report students ranging in number from three to five hundred. Within these limits as to numbers the cost of efficiency need not vary as much as the difference in numbers might indicate.

**Note 4.**  
**Salaries**

The salaries assigned to the faculty of the minimum college are minimum as judged by what the teachers must have, but they are maximum as judged by what the college can pay. The president of such a college must be a man worth much more than \$2,500 per year, but he must be willing to work for that amount until his college gets much more money than we assign to it. Less than this amount would probably impair his efficiency.

For fifteen hundred dollars per year a college can get competent teachers from one or all of three classes of candidates: namely, young men who have not yet



completed their professional training, or who, having taken their graduate degrees, have not yet had teaching experience; secondly, older men without complete academic training but with a history of successful teaching; thirdly, men with complete training and successful experience who are willing to sacrifice for the sake of the institution or the cause. If the president be a good judge of the untried men, or if he be providentially guided in finding the older men, he may maintain his college for a considerable time while paying the salaries indicated. The younger men, however, if they are good college men, will move on; the older men will wear out. Unless the college, within a reasonable time, can reach a higher standard of salaries it must finally confess defeat.

It is thought that the salaries assigned to the teachers in the theoretically efficient college will provide, in the average college town, for all the needs of the college teacher except that represented by the pension. If the college has no pension fund of its own, and its teachers are not eligible to a pension from any other source, the salary, to be economically sufficient, should be not less than three thousand dollars. This is said with reference to the full professorship, and contemplates permanency, if possible, a life work on the part of the teacher who has demonstrated his value to the institution. Associates and assistants may be younger men who can, during their earlier years, accept smaller salaries.

In the case of College No. 1 itemized information with regard to salaries has not been obtained. The regular salary for a full professorship in this college, however, is \$3,500. In the case of a few professorships provision is made for larger salaries. Upon one foundation a salary of \$5,000 may be paid. The salaries of associate professors range from \$1,600 to \$2,500.

**Note. 5.** A study of college organization and finances presents to view a maze of varying forms and facts. It would be a very great gain if it were possible to standardize college organization and an immensely greater gain if college finances could be standardized. College organization, however, has been shaped through two and three-quarter centuries of American history, amid varying conditions and to serve purposes which, while similar in their larger aspects, have been almost infinitely different in their particular ends. For these reasons only general similarity in matters of organization may be possible or even desirable. College finances, however, can and should be standardized in accordance with well established principles of accounting. This, if brought about, would open the way to the solution of many difficult problems of college administration.

It is thought that the analysis of college organization, as presented in this paper, will be, for the most part, self-explanatory. The content and limitations of the subdivision under the head of "Instruction" will be indicated at a glance. Under the head of "Administration" are grouped all the activities of the college which have to do with the management of its affairs or the promotion of its interests. There would be no question with regard to any item mentioned in this connection unless it might be the one naming the Librarian and his assistants as members of the administrative force. There seems to be no other place to put them. They are not instructors, and they are not used merely for the maintenance and care of the physical property of the institution as are janitors and firemen. They place and keep at the disposal of students, for educational purposes, a certain part of the educational equipment of the college. Their functions, if not administrative, are more nearly related to those of administration than to any others.

**Note 6.**  
**Academic**  
**Rank**

Much difference in practice is found in the academic ranking of instructors. College No. 1 has abolished the rank of "assistant professor," their teachers being designated as "professors," "associates" or "instructors." The policy in this institution is to increase the number of teachers who rank as full professors. The reason given for the adoption of this policy is that the underclassmen should be taught by instructors as well qualified in every respect as those assigned to the upper classmen. In the new colleges, especially in the West, there is less distinction with regard to academic rank. In many institutions practical impartiality is observed by designating as "professors" all instructors without regard to their age, preparation or previous condition of academic service.

**Note 7.**  
**Publicity**

In recent years publicity has been recognized as both a formative and corrective force in every public or semi-public enterprise. Colleges are community enterprises. Those with which this paper deals are largely maintained by the income of trust funds. They are chartered by the state. Public welfare requires that there be no chance to conceal anything in the management of such an institution. Descending to the details of administration, publicity even with regard to individual salaries will protect a deserving teacher from a hard-fisted board of trustees. It will protect a soft-hearted but impecunious board of trustees from an aggressive teacher who wants more than his fair share of the limited funds available for salaries. It would tend to equality in the treatment of the different members of a faculty and, if trustees and presidents faced things fairly, it would tend to weed out all teachers who are receiving relatively more than they are worth to the college. In the administration of the college resources, it would show where money is being wasted in some places and where it is being too sparingly used in others. It would give all the colleges the

benefit of the valuable experience of those which are being successfully administered, and this would be a great gain.

#### CONCLUSIONS

If the facts and the reasoning of the paper are accepted, we are prepared now to give an answer to the question with which we began by saying that an efficient college having an enrollment of four hundred students should have a faculty of forty teachers, total assets of about three millions of dollars and an annual income of about one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. Perhaps this statement will be clearer if put in tabular form as follows:

##### ORGANIZATION:—

Students	400
Faculty	40

##### FINANCES:—

Plant, value of,	\$1,000,000.00	
Endowment, amount of	2,000,000.00	\$3,000,000.00

Income,			
Student fees,	20 per cent,	\$ 25,000.00	
Endowment,	80 per cent,	100,000.00	\$ 125,000.00

Budget,			
Administration,	15 per cent,	\$ 18,750.00	
Instruction,	55 per cent,	68,750.00	
Maintenance,	30 per cent,	37,500.00	\$ 125,000.00

Per student,			
Total investment,		\$	7,500.00
Endowment,			5,000.00
Annual cost,			
Met by endowment,	\$	250.00	
Paid by student,		62.50	\$ 312.50

Attention may be called to the quantitative relations indicated as desirable between the income from student fees and the income from endowments. Similar relations are indicated as existing between the three parts of the budget. With regard to income, it is quite clear that a college cannot be considered efficient while any considerable part of its income is derived from uncertain sources such as annual donations.

The relation between the different parts of the budget may vary somewhat on account of local conditions. The tendency, however, in the interests of efficiency, would be to increase the expenditure for instruction.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that the permanent efficiency of a college is dependent upon the amount of its income from endowments as compared with its necessary activities.

**Supplementary Note.** It may be that there is a better word than "Efficient" which could be used in describing the adequately equipped and endowed college. As yet, however, no such word has been found, and the discussion in the meeting at Chicago failed to produce one. Since the paper will be revised, it has been thought best to retain the present terminology in this reprint. Correspondence with regard to this and all other matters discussed in the paper should be addressed to Rev. Calvin H. French, Care of the College Board, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

---

#### DISCUSSION.

CHARLES NELSON COLE, DEAN OF OBERLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES.

Mr. President and members of the Association:

I think it is perfectly obvious that a complete discussion of a paper so comprehensive as this would take more time than anyone ought to occupy in a meeting like this. I have consequently chosen some few points that have appealed to me as things I should like to talk about and have not tried at all to cover the whole ground.

I should like to launch the discussion of Doctor French's paper by expressing the highest kind of appreciation of what I believe is the real value of such a study as this is. It seems to me a most hopeful sign of solid and enduring educational progress that we are extend-



ing gradually and yet surely and constantly the scope of careful measurement and exact knowledge over more and more of the educational field. Take, for example, the treatment of the minimum college in this paper. It is on the whole, the most carefully worked-out part of the discussion, and seems to have appealed to Doctor French as perhaps the most important part of his subject, as, indeed, it really is. Now, we have been content for a good while, something like ten years, I believe, with the definition of a college on its lowest terms formulated by the Carnegie Foundation. That definition recognizes as a college any institution that requires fourteen units for admission and sixty year-hours for graduation, that has not less than six teachers devoting all their time to instruction of college grade, and that possesses at least two hundred thousand dollars in endowment. Nothing is said in that definition about the number of students that such a college may properly assume to care for, nor about the material equipment necessary for whatever number it actually does accept. Doctor French pushes the question very much further, and, it seems to me, to a much better result. His minimum college, while making the same requirements for admission and for graduation, asks for seven professors who devote all their time to teaching, a president whose time is wholly spent in promotion and administration, an annual expenditure of twenty-seven thousand dollars, property worth two hundred thousand dollars, and an endowment of three hundred thousand dollars. The number of students for which such a plant may provide he limits to one hundred. Here we have at least a measure of sufficient completeness and definiteness to warrant cordial recognition as a distinct advance upon what we have had before. Very commendable also is the precision with which Doctor French indicates the use to be made of every part of the college outlined: the amount and content of each teacher's work; the annual expenditure for adminis-



tration, teaching, and maintenance; everything, in fact, that is needed for fullest appraisal and testing of the whole scheme. And the method of his investigation, finally, seems to me an excellent one. There are distinct advantages in the plan of first working out in theory a consistent and ordered whole, with all its parts in correct balance and in proper relation to each other, and without the adjustments and compromises that all of us know necessarily come about in the course of actual administration. If then the details of such a plan are carefully checked up with the experience of a number of institutions, as has been done in this paper, the probability of reaching at least a straight course to a satisfactory result seems the strongest possible.

After so much in commendation of Doctor French's study, it may be permissible to suggest that in the conclusions reached it still leaves something to be desired. With all the advance he has made over what we have had before, I think that Doctor French has yet left his requirements in some respects too low for even a minimum college, if it is to be a genuinely adequate, working college. The requirements for admission and for graduation are, to be sure, the usual, generally accepted ones. But the curriculum is perfectly rigid; the faculty is confessedly inadequate; the president takes no part in the teaching; and the student body is supposed to be absolutely stable, one hundred in number, with twenty-five in each class, continuing at exactly that number from matriculation to graduation. Such an institution as a whole is imaginary, and in part is quite impossible. It may serve well enough for a first picture, admittedly wholly theoretical, but it seems to me entirely inadequate for the purpose for which, as a practical matter, it was framed. It is something less than a safe guide for determining whether a given college, so-called, should reduce itself to a junior college or to a secondary school,

or should instead devote itself with more determination to the task of achieving a satisfactory standard.

Let me deal in order with the details to which I have objected. To the rigid curriculum the great objection is that, as things now go in college, we are not satisfied with a course composed of a certain number of units, arbitrarily chosen and arranged, every one of which must be taken in its turn by every student, with no opportunity for addition at any point. It seems to be generally recognized today that a college student does not obtain an education really worthy of even a minimum college unless he has running through it a substantial core or backbone, such as is designated in many curricula as the major study, a group, or something of that kind. But such a thing is impossible in a college limited as closely as this one is. There is, to be sure, provision for forty-five undesignated year-hours in addition to the sixty that are exactly specified, but, as Doctor French pointed out, not all of these can be used for additions to the offerings in the several subjects. Some will have to go into extra sections of classes, and some may be required for administrative service. Even if we could have fifty per cent more than is definitely designated in this curriculum, we should still not have, it seems to me, nearly what is required for an actual institution really worthy to be called a college. In this curriculum, just as it stands, a student may have but four years of language study, one language each year. It may be Greek or Latin or German or French, whatever the college happens to be offering in the year in question, but two languages cannot be taken at once, nor can there be any choice, unless provision is made for it in the undesignated margin. One year course is offered in each of four sciences, and there is no possibility of more, unless by grace of the margin. There are two years of English; a year and a half each of mathematics and of history; a year of philosophy; a half-year each of psychology and of educa-

tion; a year of economics and sociology; and a year of Bible, distributed in the form of half-courses over two years. With all possible allowance for the margin, this is clearly not enough for even a minimum modern college.

I have been trying to frame for myself an outline of what might be called the irreducible minimum of a real, working college. I believe that with eight departments and some assistance in teaching from the president a plan could be worked out so much better worth while as fully to justify the extra cost. The courses in each department need not be identical every year. It is perfectly feasible, and I think very desirable, to have in the upper years of such a curriculum alternating courses, in which seniors and juniors work together in successive years on material of about the same grade. The amount that can be offered to the student may be considerably increased in this way, without increasing the amount of teaching required. My tentative scheme would be substantially as follows:

1. Ancient Languages

Greek—Beginning	3 hrs.	3 hrs.
Advanced (alternating)	3 "	6 "
Latin—Freshman	3 "	3 "
Sophomore	3 "	3 "
Advanced (alternating)	3 "	6 "
	—	—
	15	21

2. Modern Languages

German—Beginning	3 "	3 "
Second-year	3 "	3 "
Advanced (alternating)	3 "	6 "
French—Beginning	3 "	3 "
Advanced (alternating)	3 "	6 "
	—	—
	15	21

3. English Composition and Literature			
Composition	3	"	3 "
Literature—First-year	3	"	3 "
Second-year	3	"	3 "
Advanced (alternating)	3	"	6 "
	—		—
	12		15
4. Mathematics and Physics			
Mathematics—Freshman	3	"	3 "
Sophomore	3	"	3 "
Advanced (alternating)	3	"	6 "
Physics—Elementary	4	"	4 "
Advanced (alternating)	3	"	6 "
	—		—
	16		22
5. Chemistry and Biology			
Chemistry—Elementary	4	hrs.	4 hrs.
Advanced (alternating)	3	"	6 "
Biology—Elementary	4	"	4 "
Advanced (alternating)	3	"	6 "
	—		—
	14		20
6. History and Government			
History—American, introductory	3	"	3 "
European, introductory	3	"	3 "
Advanced (American or			
European, alternating)	3	"	6 "
Government—American	3	"	3 "
European, municipal, etc.,			
(alternating)	3	"	6 "
	—		—
	15		21

7. Economics and Sociology			
Economics—Elementary	3	"	3 "
Second-year (alternating)	3	"	6 "
Third-year (alternating)	3	"	6 "
Sociology—Elementary	3	"	3 "
Advanced (alternating)	3	"	6 "
	—		—
	15		24
8. Psychology, Philosophy, Education, Bible			
Psychology—Elementary	3	"	3 "
Advanced (alternating)	3	"	6 "
Philosophy—Elementary	3	"	3 "
Advanced (alternating)	3	"	6 "
Education—History	3	"	3 "
Advanced (alternating)	3	"	6 "
Bible, Christian doctrine, etc.,	3	"	3 "
	—		—
	21		30
Grand total	123		174

With reference to the inadequacy of the teaching staff there will be no difference of opinion, if the conclusions regarding the number of departments needed are accepted as sound. Even with the eight professors suggested, the assistance of the president in teaching will be required, and this has been planned to be given to the last department listed. It does not seem clear that in a very small college, at least in such a one as the minimum college described by Doctor French, the president must spend all his time in administration and promotion. That college has an endowment of three hundred thousand dollars and property to the value of two hundred

thousand dollars to start with. Its budget is so framed that the income from endowment will meet the expense, above the amount contributed by students in fees and room-rents, except for an estimated \$2,500 to be secured annually in gifts. Raising this amount, and assisting in securing twenty-five to fifty new students, ought not to take a president's whole time, though it would be easy for him to allow it to do so. Aside from that, it seems to me that an institution is unfortunate whose president does not make every effort to keep the close touch with his teaching staff that he can have only by sharing in their labors and meeting day by day their problems. In this respect at least he is better off if he keeps up teaching. He is better off from his own standpoint, too, if he is studying and teaching, for he keeps alive his intellectual forces as he could hardly do otherwise. I should insist that in the minimum college the president must do a certain amount of teaching.

As for the stable student body and the importance of dividing it into uniform classes of twenty-five, the simple fact is, as the paper admits, that it cannot be done. Natural causes, quite beyond the power of any institution to control, take out from twenty to twenty-five per cent of the freshmen class, fifteen per cent at least of the sophomore class, and a small percentage of the junior class within and at the end of the respective years. The very fact that these losses occur produces small classes in some cases and larger classes in other cases. We must deal with irregularity and we must meet it with a larger teaching staff and with a larger cost for instruction. Since this is the case, I wonder whether it would not be much better worth while to formulate as a plan for a minimum college not one that obviously will not and cannot meet the conditions that do and must exist, but one that is really adequate to the practical needs of the situation?

After reaching these conclusions and finding myself



so much above Doctor French's estimates, I was somewhat reassured to discover that the late Professor Charles R. Henderson, when he attacked the problem in 1908, thought that a college of two hundred students should have not less than eight professors and sixteen instructors and an average expense of not less than thirty-seven thousand five hundred dollars for a college of minimum efficiency. Exception may be taken to many of Doctor Henderson's positions, but his results at least afford some further basis for holding that we ought to stand for a higher minimum than is laid down in Doctor French's paper.

The discussion of the "efficient" college reaches, I think, more satisfactory results. For a college of four hundred students the provision of forty teachers, a million dollars' worth of property, and two million dollars in endowment would probably be found quite adequate. The only point about which I would raise a question is the assumption, often made, but neither made nor denied by Doctor French, that the proper number of students for the efficient college is somewhere between three hundred and five hundred. As the head of a college of arts and sciences that sets its limit now at one thousand and proposes to hold to that limit only until a point is reached where we can be sure of providing adequately for a larger number, I could hardly be expected to let that assumption go without paying my respects to it. It must be admitted, I think, that the tendency of institutions generally is, when numbers begin growing, to take the increased income as a gift from the Gods and to try to get along with as nearly the same staff and equipment as possible. But granted that one is willing to make the necessary expenditure to keep the staff and the equipment up to at least an equal average of effectiveness for the larger number of students, there are some decided gains in having the increased numbers. In Oberlin we have grown in the last fourteen years from about

four hundred students to just one thousand, the number at which we have voluntarily stopped. I see some positive advantages enjoyed by the students who come there today that were not possessed by their predecessors of fourteen years ago. To mention no others, there is a much broader curriculum, with many more highly specialized courses than could be maintained when the college was smaller; there is a greater institutional spirit, a healthy feeling of satisfaction on the part of students and faculty alike at sharing in the life of a great institution; there are larger possibilities of wide and cosmopolitan acquaintance for the students; and, lastly, there are enough men and enough women to overcome in a measure a special difficulty of the coeducational college, that of having too small a number on each side of the house to take such a part in many outside activities as the standing of the college would seem to deserve. There is nothing to be said, of course, against the perfect effectiveness of an adequately equipped college of two hundred or three hundred or four hundred students, but it seems to me a mistaken assumption that effectiveness necessarily diminishes with increase in numbers.

With the conclusions reached by Doctor French at the end of the paper I am for the most part in hearty agreement. I have some doubts, however, about even the general validity of the quantitative relations recommended as desirable, particularly in the case of the items that make up the expenditure. Administration, for example, instead of remaining uniformly at fifteen per cent of the expense account of institutions of varying sizes, may well be made less for the very small college, and may need to be larger in the great university, if it is to be kept genuinely efficient. I have been wondering, since reading this paper, whether it would not be advisable to continue the work on the minimum college and bring it to a thoroughly satisfactory result, and then

to formulate corresponding plans for colleges with successive increments of, say, one hundred students, indicating what the conditions ought to be all along the line to secure the best results? Conclusions would have to be subject to revision in accordance with the special circumstances of various institutions, of course, but something of this general sort might be practical and very valuable.

Finally, I would raise the question whether it would not be well for this association, after reaching whatever conclusions seem best in regard to its standard for a minimum and an efficient college, at least to publish as widely as possible its intention to stand for the standard. It may not be wise to insist upon it for membership in the association, but there could at least be an emphatic expression of belief on the part of the association that an institution ought not to be regarded as a real college unless it reached the standard. And if, in addition to the objects mentioned by Doctor French as capable of being forwarded by such a study as this, the new standard should be made the basis of a determined effort to influence legislatures to retard the birth rate of institutions with vastly inferior standards, a most useful work would be accomplished, about as useful, I should think, as the Association could wish to undertake.

---

#### DISCUSSION.

H. T. SPALDING, REGENT OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY.

I thought you might like to hear a word about a number of colleges that are run with no endowment. I am a member of the Jesuit Order. We conduct in this country thirty-two colleges. When we join the Order we give up our lives to the work of teaching but do not draw any salary. This has enabled us to build up in this country these thirty-two colleges and to conduct them.

Here in Chicago there are fifty of us working. A great many of us lecture a little and a few of us have written books and we have a steady revenue from work of this ministry and all of the income goes into the college. In a number of years it amounts to a very considerable sum. It has enabled us throughout the country to own plants that vary from three hundred thousand to three or four million dollars. A few Catholic institutions like the Catholic University and Creighton University are endowed but most of them have what I call an endowment of men, that is men giving their lives to education without drawing any salary.

What I have said of the Jesuit colleges is true of other Catholic colleges. If we did not have this endowment of men I believe that we should require an endowment of money equal to the amount called for in Dr. French's report.

---

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS.

DONALD J. COWLING, PRESIDENT OF CARLETON COLLEGE.

The members of the Association will remember that a year ago the U. S. Commission of Education invited this Association to appoint a member on a committee to be made up of representatives of the principal educational associations of America for the purpose of co-operating with the Department of Education at Washington in an effort to improve the standards in institutions of higher learning in America. The other associations invited to be represented on this committee were the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland; the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States; the Association of American Universities; the National Association of State Universities; the American

Medical Association; the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations; the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education; and the Association of American Law Schools,—eleven in all. All of the group, except the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and the Association of American Law Schools, have accepted the Bureau's invitation. The others, I understand, still have the matter under consideration.

This action on the part of our National Bureau of Education in calling together a representative co-operating committee, is an expression of its continued interest in an undertaking begun several years ago, and which resulted in Dr. Babcock's tentative classification of colleges in 1911.

This work was undertaken at the suggestion of the deans of the graduate schools represented in the Association of American Universities, and this Association has attempted since 1913 to carry forward this work of classification for its own purposes, but its findings have not been made public.

Dr. Babcock's preliminary and tentative list was based largely upon information and judgements received from the principal graduate schools of the country, and was designed specifically to indicate the status of the bachelor's degree granted by the various institutions listed. This work was never completed. Only 200 copies of the preliminary list were printed. These were intended as proof-copies for the use of the deans of graduate schools and some of the larger professional schools and were never intended for general distribution or for newspaper use. Unfortunately, the preliminary list got into the newspapers and its purpose was wholly misunderstood.

Whatever may have been the merits of the list as an accurate and just classification, there can be no doubt as to the very genuine public interest that was aroused by it. Dr. Buttrick, of the General Education Board



once told me that he had observed that all those who were given place in Class I recognized the plan a most excellent one, while most others believed it to be a capital blunder.

A revised edition of this classification was in the press in September, 1912, but its publication was prevented by special order of President Taft. The Bureau is therefore unable to complete the work in the form in which it was originally begun.

But the Bureau has a conscience as well as convictions, and it realizes that in the case of many institutions, injustice has been done by the publicity given to the first preliminary list and some institutions have been placed under a cloud whose standards and work are well able to bear the light. This fact has made the Bureau conscious of its responsibility in the matter and has made it anxious to contribute in every way possible to the solution of a difficult and delicate problem. The Bureau has also come to feel even more strongly than five years ago the necessity for some comprehensive and widely-recognized record of college standards and resources.

There are of course many agencies at work in America attempting in one way or another to classify colleges and universities. The Bureau at Washington has a record of between twenty and thirty of these classifying or standardizing agencies operating on a larger or smaller scale.

The following statement by Dr. Capen puts in brief form the reasons why these agencies have sprung up and why we may expect them to continue their work in the future: "Since we have neither state supervision nor any real requirements in most states for charters empowering institutions to grant degrees, this activity is necessary. No defense is needed. Yet it is worth while to call attention to two facts. First, students are migrating from one institution to another in constantly increasing numbers. Strong and honorable institutions must, therefore, sit in judgment upon others in order

to protect their own standards from the depressing and contaminating influence of weak or dishonorable ones. Second, prospective students and their parents have a right to know the standing of institutions which seek their patronage."

To these cogent reasons assigned by Dr. Capen I should like to add one more: I believe there can be no question about the wholesome effect of publicity upon those officially responsible for the college, nor of the fact that a knowledge of what reasonable standards require is a spur and incentive to efforts for betterment. Wide-spread discussion of such problems, particularly when based upon facts, inevitably results in better conditions, as has been abundantly proved in the past five or ten years.

In stating further the consideration had in mind by the Bureau in suggesting the formation of this co-operating committee, Dr. Capen says: "It is our purpose to seek advice as to the desirability of further attempts at classification and as to the methods which should be used if some action were deemed advisable. We also thought it worth while, from our point of view, to have a committee associated with us to share some of the odium attaching to any future publications on this exceedingly tender subject."

This joint-committee, representing the associations I have already named, met at the Bureau in Washington on the third day of last May. After a general informal discussion, it appeared to be the unanimous judgment of those present that a critical statistical study of colleges and universities is desirable, and that the only debatable question is concerning the method by which this study should be undertaken and carried out.

It was also agreed that a separate study should be made of the radically different types of institutions which continue the training of high school graduates. Five distinct studies are, therefore contemplated, dealing with the following types of institutions: colleges of

liberal arts and sciences, engineering schools, colleges of agriculture, schools of mines, and teachers colleges. It was understood that normal schools should not be included except as they meet the requirements of teachers colleges.

It will be observed that the purpose of the committee in this respect differs from that of the North Central Association as determined upon at their meeting a year ago. Their action definitely states that their plan does not "distinguished between colleges and universities, or colleges and normal schools. They recommend rather a comprehensive formula including all grades of institutions. They anticipate that the result of the adoption of this plan will be the ultimate development of a system of rating which may be used for high schools as well as for higher institutions."

Your joint-committee believe that the other plan is better adapted for the purposes of a national list, and it proposes to define the terms "college" and "university" and other important terms relating to its inquiries, and to publish these definitions with its other findings.

A third decision arrived at by the joint-committee was that no attempt should be made to divide institutions into classes such as Class I, Class II, or Class A, Class B, etc. The work which the joint-committee is willing to undertake is a critical and statistical study of institutions, and not a classification. This purpose is indicated by the name by which the committee decided to style itself, namely, "The Committee on Higher Educational statistics."

It is hoped that the results of the work of the committee will furnish sufficient data for whatever classifications may be necessary,—that the deans of the various graduate and professional schools, for example, may be furnished such information as will enable them to form a just judgment of any given college, without themselves being obliged to conduct a separate investigation.

The whole plan of an official ranking of institutions

is open to very serious objections. Dr. Capen has summarized these objections as follows: "Aside from the fact that the Bureau cannot classify colleges, I am willing to confess that personally I am inclined to regard classifications as dangerous things, necessary though they may be for certain purposes. A single just standard is impossible. The United States is a large country; the educational needs of its different sections are diverse. The school systems also in these sections are widely divergent in extent and quality of instruction. Colleges are bound to all other educational agencies in the localities which they serve. Just comparisons, therefore, which shall be nation-wide are out of the question. Moreover, classification implies a definition, and a definition carries with it the danger of crystallization of the thing defined. The college is a living organism. It is pursuing a varying succession of aims, a series of temporary goals; that is why it is so hard to define and why no definition sticks. I would deprecate any action on a national scale which would tend to arrest its growth or the growth of the concept of the college in the minds of those whose business it is to think about it."

But objectionable as any formal classification must necessarily be for the reasons indicated, it was nevertheless the unanimous judgment of the committee that there could be no reasonable or legitimate objection to the public knowing the facts about any given institution, even though that institution should be justified in diverging widely from the recognized standard of its type. Such publicity would not only be in the interests of educational righteousness, but in cases where institutions are actually justified in diverging from ordinary standards, the facts constituting such a justification would be made available and thus new material would be furnished for educational inquiry and experiment.

The committee has decided that its first study shall concern itself with colleges of liberal arts. Its plan is to determine upon a list of such categories as may

be necessary to furnish an adequate basis for a well founded judgment the material equipment, teaching efficiency, atmosphere, and scholarly results of any given institution. When such a list of categories shall have been determined upon, it is planned to publish a list of liberal arts colleges, classified by states, and to indicate in connection with each institution the available facts under each of the headings agreed upon. The committee is at the present time working upon this list of categories—the ear marks, if you please, of a good college. When they have agreed among themselves concerning these points and determined upon the form in which the inquiry shall be made, it is planned to submit the blank forms of inquiry to every institution in the country which claims to be a college or university, in order that their criticisms and suggestions may receive full consideration before the actual study of institutions is begun.

I have with me this morning the blank forms as they have been made out by the Secretary of the Committee, Dr. Capen, although they have not yet been approved by the Committee as a whole.

---

#### DISCUSSION.

THOMAS FRANKLIN HOLGATE, DEAN OF NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: The nature of the report presented, being a report of progress of the Committee in Consultation with the Commissioner of Education, makes it as you will recognize difficult to discuss. The whole matter of standardizing has grown up in the last eight or ten years as a result of conditions which have existed in this country for many years through lack of supervision of higher education. That some method of estimating the merits of various institutions is necessary will readily appear. Colleges and Universities in this country are easily established and are subject to little control. For instance, in the State of Illinois, any three men may take out a charter for a university and may



conduct it without capital, teaching staff, or equipment, and may confer academic degrees without hindrance. The public health is guarded by a provision that to qualify for conferring degrees in medicine, pharmacy, or dentistry an institution must meet certain specifications as to equipment, but non-professional degrees may be freely conferred.

I confess to a dislike of the term "standardization." In the pamphlet issued by the Bureau of Education a few years ago, the well known Babcock report, issued privately, the term "standardization" does not appear. It was as represented, a classification. Standardization bears with it the notion of constraint, the fitting of things into certain grooves, according to fixed conditions, a restriction of freedom, rather than the evaluation of things as they are. Nevertheless we must admit, following the discussion of Dr. French's paper this morning, that certain recognized standards must be applied to the college in order to measure its efficiency. Only in so far as the college meets these standards will it command the respect of the community in which its work is done.

Whether or not the institution is meeting the standards depends on matters of fact and these facts must be procured and must be made public in some way. It must be admitted by those of us who have to do with college catalogues, that while we make annually, a keen effort to present all the facts concerning our institution, in annual publications, somehow these become distorted, so that, to the public mind, they convey false impressions. In fact, it sometimes happens that the statements presented are actually disputed. Catalogues are not reliable sources of information, at least, they alone are not sufficient authority on the condition of a college.

The Babcock report was an exceedingly valuable document for the special purpose for which it was issued.

but it gave relative rankings of institutions without detailed information. The mode of procedure proposed by the Committee has many advantages. The Bureau of Education acting in co-operation with a joint committee representing various interested bodies can procure reliable data on the equipment and workings of colleges, universities, and professional schools. These can be safely published and will be subject to criticism only in matters of fact which can readily be verified or corrected. With such body of facts in hand, any association such as ours, the North Central Association, the Association of American Universities, or any association that is interested in standardizing, in classifying, in arranging colleges in groups for particular purposes, will have the material with which to proceed. Any number of classifications can then be made to serve any temporary or local purpose.

Let me repeat that the Bureau of Education is in my judgment the best agency for gathering and presenting data regarding the various educational institutions of the country.

---

### THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

PHILANDER P. CLAXTON, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION OF  
THE UNITED STATES.

---

By reason of the many engagements of Commissioner Claxton, he has been unable to revise the transcript of the stenographic record of his Address upon the Junior College.

The following abstract has been made by the Secretary, without the revision of Commissioner Claxton and is incorporated here for the purpose of indicating the substance of the Commissioner's Address, and is printed here in lieu of the Address.

The Commissioner promises a special bulletin of the Bureau of Education, thoroughly covering the entire topic of the Junior College.

The portion of the following abstract given in quotation marks is taken from manuscript.

BY THE SECRETARY.

Now, I want to read for you what probably most all of you have read. It is a section of an address made at Allegheny College. In talking about some of the things which I thought should be done for these independent colleges, I said among other things:

"Two hundred or more of the smaller colleges should, I believe, become Junior Colleges, attempting to do only two or three years of college work, preferably only two years. These Junior Colleges should require for admission the same degree of preparation as is required by the standard four-year colleges and should not attempt to maintain preparatory departments. I know of no reason why any institution calling itself a college anywhere in the United States should now require less than the full fourteen units. They should, on the other hand, concentrate all their energy, means and equipment of buildings, laboratory, library, and teaching force on doing well and in a large and strong way the work of the first two college years. For the work of instruction they should employ men and women of the best native ability, good scholarship, and the highest skill in teaching. The instructors should have a comprehensive grasp of the principles of education, its aims and ends and its relation to life. They should be whole-souled men and women with sympathy for boys and girls at this most critical period of their life, with high ideals, and power to inspire them to the best. Two things, or three things, will come from any college course: one is information, another is discipline in drill, but the most important of all is inspiration, desire, purpose, ambition, the determination to acquire and to do something in the world. And it is very important that in these first two years of college work where that is gotten more than at any other time there should be men who have outlooks on the world and can inspire desire, purpose, and help to make will. Here, more than elsewhere, are needed teachers answering to Daniel Coit Gilman's description: "tall men, broad-shoul-

dered men, sun-crowned men", or women like unto them. In these days the personality of the teacher probably counts for more than at any other time, as did the kind of personal contact which students had with the principal members of the faculties of the old-time colleges but which they no longer can have in the larger colleges of today, nor with men of the highest ability in most of the smaller colleges as they are now organized. Ideals, inspiration, desires, and enthusiasms may count for more here than technical knowledge of subjects however accurate and thorough. For two years of college work these schools with comparatively small incomes might hope to pay a few teachers, of the kind I have tried to describe, sufficient salaries to hold them for this most important work, and to equip laboratories and libraries adequately, so that a minimum of the time of the students would be lost. The importance of this will be better understood if it is remembered that more than sixty out of every hundred that enter college leave at or before the end of the year, never to return. What college does for them must be done in these two years, or even in one year. One of the objections I have heard made to the junior college is that it cuts off so many of the students with two years unless they go elsewhere. Just remember that almost 56 per cent now of the students who enter the freshman class remain in college only one year or less, or two years. They are gone before they enter the junior year.

After finishing the two years of the junior college, students should, of course, be advised to go for the last two years of college work to the larger and richer colleges which are able to equip their laboratories and libraries, employ large numbers of specialists for the more technical work of these years. Can there be any doubt that under these conditions many more would enter and remain through these advanced classes than now do or that the sum total of results of the four years

in college would be much larger than it now is for most students? For most students the two years of junior work might be made almost the full equivalent of what is done now in three and the better preparation and the stronger impulse gained would insure better results in the last two years also.

Of course this better type of work in the smaller junior colleges would soon compel the larger colleges to make like provision for their first and second year students who are now too often crowded into over-large classes or sections and given into the hands of young and inexperienced teachers quite different from the ideal set forth above and seldom come in contact with the larger and more experienced men and women who make the reputation of the college. There are now colleges with 1200 to 2000 students and they make up a mob, and they fall largely into the hands of undergraduate students who have had little experience in teaching and may never turn out to be men and women of the kind I refer to above. Some of these younger and more inexperienced teachers do prove to be men and women of the first type and make good when they have had more experience, but many only prove themselves to be unfit.

That you may understand still better the need for this reorganization of our colleges, let me call your attention to the following significant facts:

In 1892 the 600 colleges reporting to the Bureau of Education had property and endowment amounting to \$200,541,375, a working income of \$17,034,614, 11,432 professors and instructors, 122,403 students. In 1914 the 567 reporting had property and endowments amounting to \$849,296,071, a working income of \$102,156,401, 31,312 professors and other instructors, and 334,978 students. The increase in twenty-two years was more than three hundred per cent in property and endowment, five hundred per cent in working income, nearly



two hundred per cent in instructors and in students. The figures for property and endowment and for working income are most remarkable. But most of the increase in property and in income, as well as in instructors and students, has been in a small per cent of the institutions, and the differences in wealth and size are now much greater than they were twenty-two years ago. Thus, our 600 colleges that reported in 1892 finally ran up to 677. It now dropped to 567, 110 less than it was about the year 1900. Some have died, some have got married, that is, they have united with other colleges, as they should, and some have taken names more in accordance with the work that they do.

In 1914, 29 colleges do not report their incomes, and 45 report incomes less than \$10,000, as low as \$3,000 a year for all incomes from all sources. Ninety-two report incomes between ten and twenty thousand dollars and 80 between twenty and thirty thousand dollars. Including in the count those not reporting incomes, as all except two or three should be,—and that takes full account of the salaries represented by men who worked without salaries, or women,—we have 246 colleges with incomes less than \$30,000. Two hundred forty-six colleges out of 567 with total working incomes less than thirty thousand dollars. You will remember that 121 of these have less than \$20,000; 29 less than \$10,000. Forty-six have incomes between forty and fifty thousand dollars. There were in 1914, therefore, 328 colleges having incomes less than \$50,000. I thought of that this morning when we were talking a minimum. The minimum that you set this morning would rule out about three-fourths of all the colleges of the United States. Sixty per cent of the colleges and universities had six per cent of the total of annual incomes, ten per cent of the total property and endowment, and 12 per cent of the college students; 40 per cent had 94 per cent of the total income, and 88 per cent of the students. Sixty per cent of all of them

had six per cent of the working income, while forty per cent had 94 per cent of the working income. Twenty-six institutions, each having \$600,000 or more working income, had thirty-six per cent of the total working incomes, and eighteen per cent of the students. Again, 93 of the colleges having incomes less than \$50,000 had less than fifty college students and 99 had more than fifty, but not more than 100 students, a total of 192 colleges with not more than 100 students. They went down as low as about 15.

In the college with fifty students, thirty-five will be in the first two years and fifteen in the last two. That is the average. In a college of 100 students, seventy will be in the first two and thirty in the last two years. Now, I know you will say that that is a discrepancy because, I said about 40 per cent of the students actually in college are in the junior and senior years; but that is not true of the smaller college. The larger the college the larger the junior and senior classes in proportion to the freshman and sophomore. As a rule, the smaller the college the smaller are these two classes in proportion to the total number.

Students left because they recognized the fact that the college had not the equipment to give them the best work, or they quit college altogether, or they go elsewhere where they could get better advantages. And the expense for teaching the fifteen and the thirty will be more than the expense for teaching the thirty-five and the seventy. If the two high classes were sent away to the larger and richer colleges the number of students in the lower classes might be more than doubled, the total attendance increased 50 per cent at least without additional cost for teaching and equipment, and all students, those remaining and those sent away, might be better taught. That is, those sent away went to other institutions. But the better teaching in the lower classes and the larger number of students attracted to and held in these classes thereby would re-

sult in more generous support, larger endowments and more adequate incomes for the colleges. In most instances most of these junior colleges would no doubt be affiliated more or less closely with one or more stronger colleges to which they would send most of their students. Not that they would be under their control at all, but most of their students would probably go to the larger colleges. Many students from the same junior colleges would therefore find themselves in the higher classes of the same institution, and would rejoice in keeping up in the larger institution the spirit of the college from which they came and in which they received their ideals and inspiration. They would think of themselves both while in the senior college and in after life, as of the college in which they spent the earlier years of their college life. Thus the junior college need not fear losing its place in the affection of its alumni.

I have dwelt on this matter of the junior colleges because it seems to me to be a matter of very great importance and because I know how difficult it is going to be to bring many institutions, that should do so, to break away from the traditional four years. Yet a beginning has already been made and there are now a score or more junior colleges in the country. Unfortunately most of them still do two or more years of high school work. This work, I feel sure, they will abandon soon. On the other hand, some of the city high schools are adding two years of college work and calling themselves junior colleges. There are a dozen such in California. There are fourteen such now, I believe in the state of California. I have said one dozen, but I think it is now fourteen."

\* \* \* \* \*

Here then is our program. First, there shall be for all children six years of elementary education, for at least 200 days in the year. We have now the shortest school term, I believe, of all the cultured nations of

the world. The rural schools in Ontario are 225 days; in Australia and in New Zealand 225 to 240; the schools of Germany, 240 to 250, and they run as high as 257 in certain states. We shall have a six-year elementary school; and we shall have in the city the teachers conforming with the children in their grade, so that we may not lose the year that we now lose in these first six years. Second, there shall be six years of secondary education based on six years of elementary education, so that the needs pertaining to the high school and the differentiating that the high school wants may be begun earlier. Ancient languages, for instance, and modern languages, for boys and girls going to college, may be so done that the boy will go to college with his six years of Latin and his six years of Greek, or he may go to the college with a modern language that he can use. He may also begin sciences two years earlier than he now does. Third, on this there shall be based your college work. And if I could do it with authority, if the Commissioner of Education of the United States could make a system, I would build up the Junior College on that, and for the two years' work in the Junior College I would give the Bachelor's degree.

With such a junior college as I have pictured, with a small college of thirty or forty thousand dollars a year income, centering all of their energies and all of their equipment on teaching, I believe they could accomplish in the two years as much as is ordinarily accomplished in the three years, and a Bachelor's degree would mean as much or more than it means now. Then I should want to give for the two years' senior college the Master's degree. The American Medical Association requires two years of college work for admission into the medical schools, and the law schools are doing the same. Certain other schools are doing the same, and for the ordinary run of professional men that would be sufficient. But for those who want a stronger

basis of scholarship there would be two years in senior college in which they would gain the Master's degree. After this they could seek professional training in medicine, law, or engineering, or would go into the three years of graduate work with the best universities,—one with five and a half million dollars of income last year, a dozen with more than a million dollars of income. With such an organization as that we could lead the world in education, and they would come to us by thousands, not only from South America and Japan and China, but they would come from European countries here.

I am going to ask your patience until I mention that other thing in the National Educational program. I don't know whether you will agree with it, but others have agreed with it, and I believe you will, that this system shall be capped by a great National University with ten million dollars of income, or thereabouts, that shall be able to do better and fuller and stronger work than any other institution in the world has ever yet been able to do, and shall be located at your National Capital with its thousands or so of men and women in its faculty, paid better than any other men and women are paid now in any educational institution in the world.

---

#### DISCUSSION.

JOHN S. NOLLEN, PRESIDENT OF LAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I was very glad to accept the invitation to discuss this paper, because I hoped in that way to learn something about the subject, but, failing to receive the advance copy of the Commissioner's paper which he was kind enough to offer to send me some time ago, I took the alternative of seeking for literature on the subject and was very much surprised to find how little there is. You find, for example, if you



look through the proceedings of the National Education Association for the last few years, that there was just one paper read on the Junior College, among all the hundreds of papers presented. That paper came to a rather negative result. A good many of us here remember that last year we had a very interesting paper by Dean Angell of Chicago University on this subject at the meeting of the North Central Association. And Dean Angell's attitude was a good deal like that of the benevolent uncle who pats the infant on the head kindly, and says, "If it has sufficient nourishment and if it doesn't die of infantile paralysis, it will probably grow up to be a very useful member of society, and may possibly some day take care of the furnace and relieve its uncle of that part of his very onerous duties." Now comes Commissioner Claxton to act as God-father of the infant, but it is a totally different infant.

The Junior College of the very exiguous discussion in gatherings like this up to date has been the junior college of the high school. The junior college that we hear of today is a very different thing, a junior college that has an independent organization, very much like that of our independent or church college. There are really several different kinds of junior colleges in the minds of people who are talking about this subject. There already exist a certain number of junior colleges, (for example, we have one at Lake Forest), connected with private secondary schools, an outgrowth, I suppose, of the old-fashioned finishing school for young women. There is also a so-called junior college that is simply the first two years of the college course in one of the universities or colleges in which the president happens to take it into his head to make that division. There is one at Chicago University, I believe. But all it means there is that students who are freshmen and sophomores are in the junior college, and those who are juniors and seniors are in the senior college.

Another type of the junior college that has been de-

veloping recently, especially in California, as the Commissioner said, is a junior college growing out of the public high school, offering two years of so-called college work given in connection with the four-year high school course. I supposed the Commissioner was going to talk about that, and I was prepared to discuss that subject. I will therefore allude to it very briefly. My feeling is that the value of such work is easily exaggerated. There may be some value to the public in having students who have gone through the four years' high school course in their home town take another year, let us say, of algebra, German, physics or English, under the same teachers and under the same conditions under which they took their other work. One thing I am quite sure of, whether these young people or their parents know it or not, we do know that these young people are not going to college, and if we know that we ought to say it. Of course, there are local conditions in California justifying a popular movement terminating in legislation. The distances are great in that state, and there are thousands of children there who are very far from good colleges. It may, therefore, be wise in California for such towns as can afford it, to give junior college work in the high school. That is an open question in my mind.

But in conditions that surround us here, for example, such provision by the high school is quite unnecessary and quite illusive, and, as a matter of fact, we know very well, because we see it in practice year by year, that there is no boy and there are few girls who have the ambition and the brains to profit fully by a college course, who are excluded from that privilege by present conditions. There isn't a boy in the State of Illinois at the present time who is not near enough to a fairly good college, which will give him a chance to earn his way if he wants to, to get a college education. And so far as that is concerned, I feel that the development of the junior college in connection with high schools in this

section or in further eastern sections is not only not desirable, but is totally unnecessary.

One reason why I feel it is undesirable, is that as we well know, in a well-organized college the work of the first two years is pretty distinctly and directly pointed towards the work of the last two years, and I think it is unfair that young people should be given the impression that they are actually going to college when they are merely doing under high school conditions two years of such work as is done by the freshmen and sophomores of a college. As far as the economy of the situation is concerned, it strikes me that if any local community has more money at its disposal for high school purposes than it is now spending, it will be far better for that community to spend more on the salaries of its teachers and high school principals or, perchance, to spend the money on the development of evening schools for "continuation work" for those who have not had the advantages of high school training. I think by such means as that the public can do infinitely better service to the rising generation than by attempting to give the young people a so-called junior college course in connection with the high school.

On the other hand, I think the Commissioner is quite right in maintaining that very many institutions that now call themselves colleges would profit themselves and would undoubtedly profit the public by becoming frankly junior colleges and doing only the work of the freshmen and sophomore years. There is a question, as the Commissioner says, that the relative expenditure in the last two years of a college course is very much greater than that of the first two years, and I should welcome moving in the direction of creating a number of really first-class junior colleges amongst the colleges that are not now able, because of lack of funds, to carry out a full program of college work successfully. I think that is a movement that ought to be encouraged by a body like this, because it would mean better teaching,

it would mean better guidance of young people toward genuine college work.

As for the final dream with which the Commissioner closes, I don't feel prepared to discuss that. It seems to me that when the time has come, which is still somewhat distant, when we shall have saved a year in the primary school years and a year in the secondary school years, then it will be time for us to discuss how it will be pertinent for our colleges to meet this new situation.

---

#### LESSONS FROM THE MUNICIPAL UNIVERSITIES FOR THE AMERICAN COLLEGES.

CHARLES W. DABNEY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CINCINNATI.

The University of Cincinnati was glad to join this association. One of a small number of municipal institutions in this country and for years the only one aspiring to be an all-around university, our faculty was for some time in a rather sad situation—the lonesome situation of not being a member of anything. In this day of multiplied societies and functions, when it is supposed that the university president has nothing to do but to go to meetings, celebrations, and inaugurations, and give and receive honorary degrees, the president of the University of Cincinnati, also had cause, if this was his ideal, to feel quite out of it. Though like you, he found work enough to do at home, it is a pleasure to be a member of this association, and come here to counsel with you and learn from you. For this very reason, however,—because in recent years we have not had the benefit of much counsel and criticism—it is with due modesty I hope that I come to talk to you on the subject assigned me. A new institution like ours, which has not had the benefit of lessons from others, may perhaps be considered impertinent in presuming to bring lessons of any

kind to the great established colleges represented here today. If, however, you will hold your president responsible for phrasing my title in this way, I will try to say a few things about the peculiar problems and methods of the municipal college.

What is a municipal university? A municipal university is not merely a university in a city, but a university of a city; that is, it is a university controlled and supported by a city. Like the state university it is a university by and of the people, as well as for the people. The earliest universities were city universities and there are still city universities in Great Britain and in Germany. Several American cities have had colleges of their own, but it is only recently that a complete university has been undertaken by a city. A few of our American cities have been bold enough to undertake a complete system of schools from the kindergarten up to and including the university—a system corresponding exactly to the state system.

The first question, therefore, to be answered is why is the municipal university necessary? Why is not the state's system of schools, headed by its university, adequate to educate all the people of the city, as well as the country, especially when supplemented by private colleges and universities, as they are in all our eastern and middle states? In short, what is the *raison d'être* of the municipal university?

The progressive democratization of education is the most remarkable thing in the history of America. It has been a steady process from the common school up to the normal school, and the college. As fast as a new type of school has become necessary, it has been established, and its opportunities have been extended more and more widely and freely to all the people. Thus progressively have the American people placed the opportunity for education within the reach of all. Is not this the grandest achievement of our civilization?

But what of equality of opportunity for the higher



or professional education? Colleges and universities which offer these opportunities should be so placed and arranged as to arouse the ambition of all the youth, and give them the chance to get that liberal, technical and professional training which will qualify them for the highest service to their generation. The question then is, have we actually placed the facilities for the liberal technical and professional education within the reach of all our American youth?

The small college has done the great work of liberal education in this country. Until recently and to a great extent still, it was the greatest power for the higher education. We hope it will ever be such a power. Located near the homes of the people, it provided the opportunity for a liberal education for many boys and girls who otherwise would not have gotten it. It trained most of our great men of old. But these colleges never could and never will provide the opportunity for the higher education for all, and they scarcely touch the higher professional and technical education.

But was it not a fact that the respect for learning, bred into the pupils by these colleges, created a class feeling in America? Class feeling is a simple thing; it is merely like seeking like. Church colleges and private institutions tend inevitably to produce it. The culture that follows several generations of education will do this even more than wealth. Democracy means an honest homogeneity, and such homogeneity cannot be produced unless all people have an equal opportunity for the higher and the professional education. The free public college and the state university were necessary, I believe, to save democracy in America from class stratification. Our state universities are our most characteristic institutions and the best witnesses for our democracy.

But all these, the colleges and universities, cannot meet the needs of all our youth. Take a single state for illustration—my state of Ohio has three state universities, two more than most states, attended by eight thou-

sand students. There are this year about twenty-five thousand students in the other colleges in the state. The number of students in these colleges has doubled in the last ten years, and it will unboubtedly again double in the course of the next decade. In twenty-five years, this number may fairly be expected to be, at least, one hundred thousand. These thousands of students come chiefly from the villages and country districts. The cities are growing rapidly, and building elementary and high schools for the education of their children. But how shall they give their young people the opportunity for the higher education? A few of the large cities have private colleges or universities located in their midst. But what shall we do for the youth of the cities having no colleges? Out of twenty-five hundred students at the University of Cincinnati, over seventeen hundred are residents of the city. In a recent year only two hundred and fifty-five college students were sent away from Cincinnati to institutions of the grade of its university. An investigation of the financial condition of the families of the students at the University of Cincinnati teaches that if this city had no college, not more than five hundred of the students in its university would be able to get away, to go away, and twelve hundred would be left at home without the higher or professional education. It is evident, therefore, that blessed as we are in Ohio with a large number of excellent colleges, they could not train all the students of Cincinnati who seek the higher education. The municipal university was, therefore, a natural and inevitable development, and marks an era in the growth of our educational system, simliar to the founding of the Normal school and the state university.

The development of the consciousness of the duty of service corresponds to this development of the institutions.

The old university was a thing apart from the life of the people. Like a city set on a hill, when it occasionally marched out of its doors to visit the people, and

bestow its benefits upon them, it was apt to celebrate the event with music and banners. It was an act of condescension to be duly appreciated. Some thirty years ago it had a twinge in its conscience and started what was called "university extension." The very name "extension" implied that the university needed to be set free to serve. "University extension" was the first step in the conversion of the University and its salvation. It was the beginning of its new life, developing in it a consciousness of its duty to the public. The normal school was the first of our public institutions to recognize its obligation to serve in training teachers. The agricultural college was the next to feel this duty, and it proceeded to make the whole state its farm and all the farmers its pupils. The state university, which had been content for some time to do only what the old universities had done, learned from the agricultural colleges how to make the whole state its campus and to co-operate with all the state's institutions in making knowledge available and useful to the people. Latest of all the municipal university is born to serve, and we hope to save the city. The justification of the municipal university is the need of the city itself.

In the early years, to meet the needs of a civilization, largely rural, our colleges were located in the country. In the development of every nation, however, there comes the period of the cities. The age of the city has arrived for us. Originally a confederation of states, America is fast becoming a republic of cities. The most important thing revealed by the last census was the fact that the rural population has now dwindled to 52 in 100. In the middle states, it has decreased to 40 and in some states to 35 per cent of the population. Everywhere the urban population is increasing ahead of the rural and in most of the old states the total rural population is steadily decreasing. Do what we can, by the improvement of country life and the development of rapid transit, to check this rush of the people to the cities, it must in-

evitably go forward. The drift of the people cityward is natural and necessary, and, therefore, cannot be checked. The city is becoming every year more important politically. In the rapidly developing life of our country, the growth of our cities has brought about economic and industrial changes so revolutionary that we must adjust our institutions and laws to them or we will fall to pieces. Democracy is being put to the test in the city as never before. Let us face the truth: We have not yet demonstrated that a free and democratic people can become intelligent, disinterested and social enough to govern themselves. The events of the last year show that democracy is going to be tested more severely in the near future. Think of all this we have yet to accomplish and then recall that the storm centre in the democracy is the city.

We have democratized the elementary and to a degree the secondary and liberal education, but we have still to organize our social and industrial life so as to secure a reasonable equality of opportunity in work and service for all men. Germany, for example, is far ahead of us in securing a fair division of profits between employer and the employed and in the care of all her workers. She is far ahead of us in her methods of directing and controlling industry and we must confess with shame, she is far ahead of us in national coherence and loyalty to the nation.

We believe Democracy can do all these things even better than the Autocracy, but there still remains much to be done.

The city has already become the intensest unit of self-government, for it is the heart of the nation, determining largely the health of the whole body. Here the pulse of the great democratic body can be counted best, and by its action the statesman-physician will diagnose the health of the whole body. In the city are wealth, youth and power; in the city also are disease, vice, greed, and graft. The city is not only the central, it is the vital

organ of the democracy. The preservation of its health and strength becomes, therefore, the supreme question of the hour. The nation will live or die with its cities.

The city is awakening. It has passed through its period of corruption and shame and entered upon its period of idealism, of vision and of re-construction. Hand in hand with the demand for the purification of the ballot and of city administration, goes the demand for higher ethical and educational standards. The university, therefore, is needed as the intellectual and spiritual dynamo of the city. The university must make the standards, and it must train the leaders. Who are the men who have stirred the people of the cities to seek this new life and to build these new and fairer institutions? Recall to mind the leaders in civic improvement in your cities. Everywhere they are college men, men who caught the fire of truth and duty at the altar of Alma Mater.

Since the application of science to government and industrial life has become so extensive, it is necessary to educate men in an increasing number of new professions. Fifty years ago, there were only about five learned professions; now there are more than fifty, and new ones are constantly being called for. I can remember when there were only four or five kinds of chemists; now there are over twenty specialties in chemistry alone. No longer do we believe that a man who has had an academic education is thereby qualified to direct a bank, manage a factory, or run a railroad. In business of all kinds, the demand for experts is constantly increasing. Experts are indispensable for most industries and desirable in all. Mere experience in the practical work is no longer sufficient in the higher places. In one line after another, we have learned to train experts not only in the theory, but in the practice as well. Fifty years ago, there were two or three schools of applied science or technology in this country; now we are building these schools everywhere, and they can



hardly meet the demands of the governments and the corporations.

For the same reasons and in the same way, cities are beginning to recognize that because a man is a clever fellow and a good political worker, he is not thereby qualified to manage the finances, to direct the education, or to handle the water supply of a great city. A demand is growing up for municipal, as well as industrial, experts. We are training men today for nearly all the services except that of the municipality.

Who, then, shall train public servants for the city? Shall the city rely upon state and private institutions at a distance to perform the task? If it does, only the sons of the well-to-do in the cities can get these positions. To exclude the poor from the opportunities of the higher education, or to train them at the bounty of the wealthy, for the service of their home communities, is surely repugnant in our Democratic ideas. It is more American to provide the means of instruction and training at public expense and at home, and so enable all qualified youth to use them freely. Experience shows that the city must look to its own men and women to do its work. The city is becoming more and more an educational institution, not merely through its schools and social institutions, but in its health, public works, and safety departments as well. The modern city is a laboratory of all the sciences, a workshop of many arts, a mart of many trades, a storehouse of information of many kinds, as well as the greatest philanthropic, educational, social, moral, and religious institution—(religious in the true sense)—in the world. The city is merely the homes organized and syndicated in a greater home. The student in this institution, the city, is, therefore, studying the process of making, developing, training and saving men. He is doing that which characterizes the man and distinguishes him from the beast, he is engaged in the process of conscious evolution. There is so far in this world no greater and better school than the city, unless it is

the nation itself. Through the study of the city the man is prepared to study the nation. Is it not strange, then, that we have been so slow to recognize the opportunity for the highest education offered by the modern city?

Certainly co-operation between the university and the city here suggested is the best way to train the new type of citizen we so much need—for all recognize that we shall never solve the problem of the city until we have better citizens in the city.

A citizenship thus trained will be a more intelligent one because it will be informed about the city work and methods; it should be a more loyal one because of what the city has given to make it; it should be a more moral one because of the responsibility thus placed upon every man for health, happiness and welfare of all his fellows. Such training should give a city a large body of citizens who not only mean to do right, but will know how to do right. Such education would give the citizenship moral solidarity as well as efficiency.

The advantages of the municipal university, over the private institution in the city, in this co-operation, are perhaps not so apparent. Undoubtedly, there are disadvantages as well as advantages in the connection. Let us consider both sides of this question.

In the first place, what are some of the advantages accruing to the municipal university over those of the university of the city? In general, they are the same as those of the state university compared with the private institution in the state. The first advantage is the great one of regular, permanent, financial support based upon the steadily increasing property values of the city. Incomes from private endowments are constantly shrinking, with the result that these funds must be constantly added to. Like the state university, the municipal university can have a mill tax, the best method ever invented for supporting a public institution. It has been suggested that such a tax will diminish the interest of private citizens in endowing the institution. State uni-

versities do not receive large donations, though there are conspicuous exceptions to this rule, like Cornell and the University of Virginia. As a matter of fact, in the experience of the few municipal colleges in existence, the interest of private donors depends entirely upon the manner in which the institutions are managed and the appeal is made for them. Every municipal university ought to be supported both by private endowments and public tax. There is every reason why all the people should, through the public tax, contribute their share to the support of the municipal college, but this is no reason why those having surplus wealth should not also contribute largely to its upbuilding. If it has to choose between public support and private endowment, however the municipal college would certainly prefer public support as the surest means of getting an increasing income with which to maintain an institution competent to do the educational work of a growing city.

There is, moreover, everything to be gained by the municipal relation in making the work of the institution effective in education and in service. The municipal university is a vital organ of the body politic, a member of the family of the city, and not a visitor in that family. It has thus the advantage of being a part of the city's educational, social, and political organization. It is a great thing to have all the citizens feel that the university belongs to them. Free tuition, or tuition at low rates is, of course, an aid in popularizing and democratizing the higher education.

But, perhaps, the greatest advantage of the municipal relation is that this connection gives the university, on its side, the right to ask the co-operation of every city department and institution, and that it gives the city and its institutions, on their side, the right to ask the help of the university whenever and wherever needed. If the object of the municipal university is to train men in real life for service in life, then no means can be more effective for realizing this purpose than this rela-

tion of the municipal university to the city. The influence and prestige gained by working with the city renders it easier to secure the co-operation of the private institutions and industrial corporations of the district. They are eager to join a system which represents all the people in their aspirations for intellectual and moral improvement and for higher efficiency in every department of their life.

Many of these things the college in the city can do as well as the municipal college. There are some things also that the college not connected with the city government will be free to do, and perhaps can do better. It might be freer, for example, to take up moral questions like prohibition and social vice; it would perhaps fight the battles of all reforms with greater success. But the municipal college has a great advantage over the private college in all co-operation with the city's schools, hospitals, charitable and other social institutions.

The most important part of the city's life is, of course, the school. The first duty of the university is to stimulate and build up the educational system. If the municipal university has a college for teachers, it can easily arrange to use the public schools for training new teachers. No special practice school can equal the real public school for this purpose.

The possibilities of co-operation with the city's own departments are, of course, unlimited. The university can serve the administrative department by holding civil service examinations. It should have a municipal reference library to supply information on municipal affairs to the members and committees of council, to city officers and citizens. If located in the city hall this library will provide a place where officers and committees can meet and get expert assistance and reliable statistics. The relation thus established will produce the best results in legislation. Such a library will also become a valuable laboratory for professors and students.

The chemical and other laboratories of the university become the laboratories for testing and investigating

all conceivable questions for the city. The budget and expenditures of the city afford many problems for study. The engineering works, highways, sewers, water works, gas works, transportation systems, etc., can be utilized by the engineering department for the training of its students; and the heads of these city departments will, in turn, use the laboratories and experts in the college. The department of public works becomes a partner of the engineering college in training young men for the service of the city. In fact the opportunities for co-operation between the city and the university are almost countless. Its theory of service to the public is the same as that of the modern state university, though its work differs as the field differs.

The disadvantages of the municipal university are the same as those of the state university. Being dependent upon the public for support, both classes of institutions must be responsive to the will of the public represented by the state or city government, and both are, therefore, subject to what we commonly call political control. Public taxation is the simplest, fairest, and wisest method of raising funds to support a public cause, and some public control must go with the tax. The boards of management are, therefore, appointed by governors or mayors, or elected by the people. The position of the municipal university today, in respect to political control, is about that of the state university thirty years ago. The state university has to undergo a period of political disturbance, now happily passed, except for a few newer western institutions, and the municipal college may have to stand the same treatment for a time. As the people of the states had to learn how to eliminate politicians from their university affairs, so the people of the cities will learn to safeguard their institutions. The democracy must some times sacrifice efficiency for freedom and opportunity, but we are slowly learning how to conduct our business for the good of all. The democracy is a school and it is now just learning how to



educate itself. How rapidly and successfully it is learning this lesson, our great and improving systems of schools and our magnificent, growing state universities testify. As the state universities have succeeded, so will the municipal university. Finally, the crowning characteristic of it is that by the very conditions of its existence, it is inseparably united to the life of the people of the city. It differs from the university in the city in that its relation to the city is one of participation in the life of which it is a vital part, rather than of co-operation with a life of which it is independent. A part of the city society, the municipal university is a vital organ of the body politic; it should be the brain directing all the other organs, nourished by them, and stimulating them in return. The city must have a spiritual head, and this spiritual head should be a university. The private university may do much to help the city and its schools; a state university in the city can do more, but a municipal university, a part of the city's life, can do most to stimulate the city's education and the city's life. The ideal head of the city is its university.

But the municipal university has a reason for existence aside from its service to the municipality. The ultimate reason for the existence of both the city and the state university is the development of men. The final test of all the institutions is the educational test. The important question to be asked about every human institution is, "What is it doing for the making of better men? Every city, therefore, ought to be a great educational institution in which no laws or customs inconsistent with this, the city's chief business, could be possible, and in which no man could live and not know the uses of knowledge and the power of truth. This we believe to be the foremost reason for the existence of the municipal university—that the city as a whole may be an institution, not only to conserve every human interest, but also to develop every human being within its boundaries.

In opening this paper, I spoke of the lonesome situation of the University of Cincinnati without an association, and without friends to counsel and advise it. I am glad to say, in conclusion, that hereafter we are not only to have the pleasure of meeting with you, but that we are to have the benefit of membership in an association of universities interested in the same line of work in which we are engaged. A year ago at Washington the Association of Urban Universities was formed for the purpose of studying the methods of co-operation between the colleges and the cities, and training for public service. This new association, which has over thirty institutional members, including not only the municipal colleges but nearly all the institutions in the cities of our country and the university of Toronto, has had two meetings, which have given us a great deal of light upon these new tasks. Should any members of this Association desire to take part with us in this effort to make our American cities better schools for our people we should be very happy, indeed, to welcome you among us.

---

#### DISCUSSION.

SAMUEL F. KERFOOT, PRESIDENT OF HAMLINE UNIVERSITY.

I have been exceedingly interested in hearing the paper of Dr. Dabney and the lessons which have been brought to us concerning the municipal universities. I presume that those of us who are located within the cities are not quite so clear of vision as we always ought to be, and do not learn so fully as we might the lessons which come to us.

I can see very well something of the philosophy of the growth of the municipal university in the very rapid growth of our urban population and the natural adaptation of our Americanism in educational facilities. The problem of the city has developed the municipal university idea. The very fact that it is growing rapidly in this country and that it has spread to England and

Germany and is pushing its way over the civilized world, is a tribute to its worth. You get a great constituency and, as has been intimated, about sixty per cent of those in attendance at a local institution, perhaps, might not have gone to college anywhere for higher education if it had not been for this municipal institution or some other college so situated, and surely "ilka scholar is something added to the riches of the commonwealth."

And then the *financial problem*. It seems natural that they have the advantage in that way over an independent, local institution. The easy way and the equitable fashion of spreading the expense is certainly to let all the people take part in it. We cannot do that in the private institutions. They therefore have this advantage.

Then, in the *great laboratory opportunities* referred to, I imagine that we are only beginning to appreciate a little the value of that, and the municipal institution has its opportunity for co-operation in a way such as no private institution can fully have. The municipal university is suggested as the crown of the city's institutions. It is considered the responsible soul of the civic life, with influence reaching into the school system, the industries, the art life, and the cultural organizations of the city. Likewise, it relates itself to the charitable work that is being done and the social work that is being carried forward. In myriad ways it can co-operate in the needs that are so vital to the very life of any city.

Now, these things mean very much, and the very fact that the spirit of service has developed and is recognized, as has been suggested here today, is a very fine evidence of our American progress. The civic conscience, the civic judgment of these things, has been such that the institution is not content with merely the class room work, but must reach out into the concrete application of the ideal and theories of the lecture hall. There is no reason in the world, it seems to me, why our denomina-

tional colleges which are similarly situated, may not learn many lessons from the municipal ideals and work expressed in these universities. In the first place we ought, in *choosing locations* for our colleges today, to remember where the people are. We are not beating the wind. We are supposed to be reaching after men, and perhaps we ought not to go one thousand or one hundred miles away from the people just because we find a beautiful spot where we can invite students to come to us. We ought to go where we can reach folks. The report of the Bureau of Education touching municipal universities refers to the old-fashioned or fresh-water colleges as those which were away from the centers or from the ports and were cloistered in sequestered seclusion. Some would dispute whether it was the best thing for us to get into the very center of the maddening throng if we are going to develop the idealism which we think is so necessary. But the fact is that we must, if we are going to do our work, go where the people are. We must learn to develop an idealism that can be applied, and the application of our idealism is such as will be found in the great centers of humanity. We must come to the people where we have all the conditions of social life about us. Why should we not take our opportunity in coming to the people and in trying to be really active in the educational part of the city life? Why should we not come to them in the industrial life? Why should we not come to them in the social life? In the charities of the cities? In the labor bureaus of the cities? In the religious life of the cities? We can do that, surely.

Take our own situation in St. Paul. We have in Minneapolis the great State University, which takes largely the place of a great municipal institution. Now, there are several other educational institutions located in the midway district in St. Paul. How can we serve the cities? We have the old cultural ideas dominating us to some extent, and we must maintain them in part,

but we are under the pressure of modern educational ideals and the student mind is appealed to by the concrete. It is not merely Christianity, but applied Christianity. It is not merely the religiously spiritual or the cult, it is the culture. We must get the laboratory method if we are going to reach the student who wants the concrete in his dealings, but does not go back behind it so much in his thinkings and wants to see the external things. One of my professors announced the other day that he would meet about twenty of his students in economics and take them out to visit a number of the great industries of that section. That is a part of the laboratory work which may be the point of contact in arousing interest, for they go out and study at first hand these conditions, as an application of what they have been studying in the class room. And then, this same professor is at the head of a Labor Bureau in the State Capitol. He takes them down there and they are related very closely in that sense, and know something of the political conditions and of the work touching the real labor problem. Another man in the same general Social Science Department in sociology is studying with his pupils the associated charities of the city and interests therein. In the Department of Religious Education, the professor is lecturing week after week to the city Sunday School teachers of all the different denominations who unite therein. President Hodgman, of Macalester, could probably report that they are doing likewise in their different departments vital to the city life. We can multiply these instances.

We ought to learn, further, the lesson from the municipal university as to our particular *responsibility*. If they feel that they have a civic conscience and that the municipal university is the spiritual head, then what ought we to feel when we have professed to have a church conscience, which we believe is a little higher in standards than the civic conscience? Beyond this or-



ganized church conscience, we are supposed to have the individual Christian impulse that will drive us into service. If we should let the municipal university do this and if we should simply set forth theories and not relate ourselves vitally to the life of the institutions about us, then we should certainly be lacking and the student mind would not be reached in the same way or appealed to as it will be if we can only relate them in this practical fashion.

Now, I think that is important for this very reason: I heard a statement, a speech, yesterday by a clergyman of the Presbyterian Church, I think it was, in the Council of Church Boards. He stated that they had in his church forty-one college men, and that about twenty of them were of some use. The others were absolute nonentities as far as the church was concerned, simply having their name on the record. Of those twenty, five were of some special use in that they were real leaders. The college men were the leaders of the church, but about five out of the forty were active. The fact is that a great many young people leave their home life and come into the city life where there are allurements on every hand. Here they are taught the lessons of the class room, and if they are not related vitally to some practical work in church or Sunday School life, the mission life or the charities of the city, they are in danger of going back so rusty in the application of their faith and of their religious principles that they are apt to enjoy the title that a great many put upon the Methodists, of "backsliders," and their last state is worse than their first. When they are brought into the institution, we need to have them so vitally allied to the city life and become such factors in the Christian service of the city that they will learn how to be leaders in Christian service when they leave the college and go into the independent responsibilities which should be assumed wherever they go. The church has its responsibility in this sense. We lose too many

of our young people, and we ought to have an active college conscience in this matter. We should learn all we can from these municipal universities and possess a conscience that will drive us out to do our full share in the responsibilities of city life.

---

### RELATION OF THE COLLEGE COURSE TO VOCATIONAL TRAINING

ISAAC SHARPLESS, PRESIDENT OF HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

We try in this country to do a great many things by universal suffrage. This has doubtless an educative effect for many voters are induced to think of matters with a certain amount of thoroughness which they otherwise would forgo. But when the efficiency of the results is considered we often have to admit that it does not compare favorably with the more autocratic method of Europe. Our city governments are sometimes weak and often demoralizing. We pay dearly for asking the electorate to consider the scientific problems involved in the choice of expert officials, and as Mr. Bryce tells us they are the most conspicuous failures in our American system. It is also in many places true that our county governments are the most inconspicuous failures. In either case we do not secure the largest possible returns from our taxes, the most advanced adaption of science to our problems, the greatest possible discouragement of the evil influences which militate against rapid and satisfactory progress.

It is true that there is another side to the question. The sense of personal liberty and responsibility, the unity and loyalty resulting from a feeling that every one has had a fair chance, the buoyancy begotten of the fact that we believe we can and sometime undoubtedly will take up every evil and remedy it—these figure largely in our history. In these larger efficiencies we may often and properly forgive the weaknesses of detail. Out of

the confusion and political trading of selfish interests and oftentimes corruption, of our great Presidential nominating Conventions has sprung the greatest line of rulers that ever graced the annals of any nation. From Washington to Wilson, the average of ability and purity and consecration to high ideals of public good has been very high. Our national record as a whole in this respect is one concerning which judicial-minded Americans may well feel great satisfaction.

Both the strength and the weakness of our American methods are shown quite as abundantly in education as in any field of efforts. No country except perhaps Japan has such popular enthusiasm for education. Our great conventions, our local institutes attended by patrons as well as teachers, our large periodical and book literature on the subject, the positive convictions of the man on the street that he knows what is right and wrong with the system and with special schools, convictions which are often embodied in legislation, all show the overpowering interest in a question which is universally felt to be a basis of much consequence of all that is good and progressive in American life and institutions. It is well worth while to have this pervasive and abounding thinking and talking. Many a youth has been drawn into the current as it swept through his social circle. Many an unambitious and thoughtless boy has been transformed into a purposeful and efficient man by the contagion of intellectual ideas thrown around him. Many a school, public and private, has been driven from the dead rut of custom by the popular life stirring about it, and the whole country is learning from the free discussion many essential conditions of a real education.

But when we attempt to apply this enthusiasm to the practical conduct of educational methods we find that in some respects it hinders rather than helps efficiency. If we have a medical or legal case on our hands we hand it over to the expert and do as he says. Not so the parent of the child to be educated. He distrusts the

theories of the teacher. He knows best what should be done for his own son. As his judgment is formed on narrow bases he makes demands which to him seem reasonable but which the specialist would condemn. "Please stop learning my boy poetry," said a discontented parent to his teacher. "He has to sell soap."

This is but typical of what is going on all over the country. Parents are demanding what seems to them to be practical, that is, directly connected with making money, and as ultimately they have the voting power to select directors and indirectly teachers they usually get it. In an autocracy the expert educators are brought together, determine the subject matter and the order of subjects to be taken, and then it is imposed on people willing or unwilling. There is none of that delightful sense of managing one's own affairs which we have in America but the children are educated and the next generation wants what it ought to have. Here we wander around through a field of experiment, getting a good thing occasionally; keeping up a pleasant sensation by knowing many things superficially, sharing in the universal interest and belief in the nobility of learning, but hardly capable of taking a statesmanlike and expert view of the whole subject.

In our public school system something is rescued by statutes limiting the subjects to be taught and the qualifications of the teachers, but even these can not stand long in the face of public opinion.

Now we have a popular demand, to a large extent a proper demand, for vocational training, and in quick response comes the opportunity, an opportunity flooding our public and private schools of all grades, our colleges and universities. Two tendencies seek for ascendancy—One asks that education should obviously pay directly into a vocation; that the hours spent in making a living in after life should determine the lessons studied and the spirit of the school. The other asks that the ideals, not necessarily the subject matter, which controlled the edu-

cational theories of the past, which were alive in Greece and Rome, which were maintained through the middle ages by the Universities of Bologna, Paris and Oxford, which came across the Atlantic in many little vessels in the 17th century, which sustained the Colonial colleges in the days of the pioneers in their conquest of the material and political difficulties of the new experiment, and which have a large place in our best colleges, should still rule in preparing men and women for the work they have to do.

Those ideals should not be pitted against each other, for there is a place for both. The scorn of the classicists for what is practical, their resistance for years to any recognition of its place, has been unwise and unreasonable. The reaction from this position has made an equally indefensive argument for the vocationalist.

It is said that Grover Cleveland when returning from a fishing trip was lost in the woods and late at night came to a fisherman's cabin. After pounding at the door a head appeared and this conversation ensued:

"Who are you?"

"I am Grover Cleveland."

"What do you want?"

"I want to stay here all night."

"All right, stay there," and the window closed.

For many years the adherents of the old courses kept the new education, long lost in the woods, out of doors; now there is danger of the reverse conditions existing.

As a matter of fact, neither should be kept in the cold. There is abundant place for both within. The vocationalists have the public ear, for their arguments are plausible. It remains for us also to convince the man on the street and on the farm that there is a large and most essential and most practical place for the education which has to do with the development of the mind and character and the preparation for leisure hours.



And why is it not a concern of the state to look after the leisure as well as the working hours. The mechanic has his eight hours a day with his employment and an equal time without it. It is doubtless well that his training should teach him how to make the most of his trade. But is it not also a matter of great consequence that he should be predisposed towards good recreation; towards an interest in the problems of citizenship, towards a group of mental and aesthetic pleasures. He gravitates to the saloon and other resorts not from love of vice or crudity but because he knows nothing better. Give him the higher and you displace the lower with its resulting degradation and criminality or at the best arrested development. If our states could fill the ordinary man with some love of learning for its own sake, the worth of a developed mind, some of the thoughts which man educated in a broad sense has, they would establish a higher material as well as social standard for the century. The vocational education does not furnish all that a worker of any sort needs, nor does it furnish that which is really most essential to our national well-being.

But in the general infusion of our education with popular demands there is danger that this view shall be omitted, that schools, even private schools and colleges, shall one by one lose their grasp on the demands of a larger training, and through ambition for numbers shall add course to course which cater to the narrow view, and thereby aid in further perverting the national standards. Many colleges are announcing technical courses for which they have no adequate facilities, with a view to catch the popular demand for practicality and so increase the student list. Earnest cries come from the scholarly members of faculties for arguments to meet these crude tendencies; for Presidents to stand against the temptations, always severe for a President, to get numbers and endowment at the expense of ideals and quality. Some recent inquiries only serve to emphasize

the increasing growth of the supply of a superficial education to meet a real but mistaken public demand. But they also call attention to the stronger emphasis laid by a smaller number of colleges on the importance of real scholarly values, upon thorough training in essential power-producing subjects, and the resistance of the temptation to take every boy for which excuse can be found, with the hope that he will not seriously injure the college standards.

We are concerned today with the age-long results of education; not necessarily produced by Greek and Latin alone, but by studies that demand serious and protracted mental effort, which teach the boy to think and work, which arouse ambition for scholarship as a worthy end in itself, which show themselves in a developed brain power rather than in obviously directed efforts towards business success.

It is not at all impossible that these results constitute the best road to business success. It would be an interesting subject for investigation whether money has rewarded the men trained for vocational and professional life more generously than those whose education has not directly had this end in view. Possibly data exist for such a study. But I should guess that if all were known the practical education has not so much an advantage in this respect as its advocates claim and as uninformed youth often think.

Nor does success in public life more often reward it. The three candidates for election for President in our recent contest were all Bachelors of Arts. All of our Presidents who were college men with one possible exception had an education of the broader pattern. Indeed it is quite reasonable to suppose that a training with a mercenary end in view would not produce the man of varied interests, judicial character and apprehension of moral and intellectual values, necessary for an intelligent and devoted servant of the public.

The men who made America a nation, who saw the

principles upon which the future must be built and established them in permanent form in the great documents and institutions of the post-Revolutionary days, were to a large extent the products of the Colonial colleges, colleges the contents of whose curricula were in the highest degree concentrated upon subjects which had little bearing upon national life and institutions. Adams of Harvard, Hamilton of Kings (now Columbia) Madison of Princeton, Jefferson of William and Mary and their many associates, brought to mature life as a result of their education, not so much available knowledge as an intelligence trained by serious study in a narrow field, and the rest followed. It is not too much to say that without these colleges, America as she is, or anything greatly resembling her, would have been impossible.

It is not necessary to assume that all tendency towards studies which look towards a profession shall be avoided. As a theological student said in answer to the examination question: "What is the church's attitude to good works?" "A few of them will not do any harm." It is the spirit in which they are pursued, the respect inculcated for all learning in other fields, the development of the sense of responsibility and the education of science, rather than the content which is important. So the intending physician may ask for his science, the minister for his philosophy and sociology, the engineer for his mathematics, and all for the very available modern language as a proper part of the college work which will best dovetail into the professional course. And yet we are pleased to note the course of Amherst and other colleges which make but little account of future vocations but demand of all the training to fit for all lines of work, with variations which are adapted not so much to the duties of business as to temperament and intellectual ambitions.

Again education by popular vote is likely to omit

the needs of a very important portion of our youths, the youths of great abilities.

Every American believes that our nation is devoted to Democracy, but many of them have very discordant or imperfect ideas as to what Democracy is and how it may be secured. That all men are not born free and equal, that life and liberty are not inalienable rights, unless there is a special definition of the words, are now largely accepted. Even the example of the author of the Declaration was repudiated by himself and the nation as he himself interpreted them. Jefferson as President with the experience gained in European courts and the best society of his own country, had an idea that he could display his Democracy by copying the rude manners of the frontiersman. This affectation did not last long, and his own good sense in a little time gained the victory.

To some of the men of this day Democracy meant the equalization of wages. They argued that as all public servants, as judges and senators, needed only ordinary sense and sound judgment, which qualities were born not made, they should therefore have only the one dollar a day of the working man. This conception of Democracy was also temporary, and disappeared when the necessity of trained leadership became more than manifest.

Many similar ones have followed, often more or less socialistic, demanding the equalization of worldly goods by distributing to the have nots a portion of the property of the haves. In various forms, sometimes veiled, and for diverse purposes this has seemed a peculiar American doctrine worthy of all acceptance.

Crude as many of these deliverances have been if it can hardly be denied that they expressed one phase of a large truth, a truth which lies at the bottom of a society which bases itself on human rights.

Similar conceptions have invaded education. The American school they say is for the people, especially

for the people who are the least capable of educating themselves, or are most handicapped by lack in power or brains of the means to rise to highest positions and vocational training seems to lend itself to this idea. So before each boy is held the prize of the Presidency or some other exalted post, and infinite pains are taken to bring up to the general level, if possible, the boy or girl of slow comprehension or slovenly mental qualities. To help those who seem most to need help, to extend the benefits of the best education to the poor and defecient in any sense, is a natural and perfectly commendable impulse of right thinking people and that it has such vogue in America is something to which we should render encouragement.

But is it the whole story? Does Democarcy mean any more than this? Let us try another definition of Democracy, one not by any means new or original, but which will undoubtedly lead to different results from those we arrive at by simply bringing up the deficient. Let us say that Democarcy means the proper and effective encouragement of every individual to make the most and best of himself and let us emphasize the rich equally with the poor, the boy with a good environment equally with the product of the slums, the brilliant talent equally with the deficient or defective youth. Such a definition will logically lead not to a level of mediocrity but rather to a wider differentiation; not only to bringing up of those born with poverty of mind spirit or estate, but to the exaltation of those who are born to be leaders, and who need as much as any the stimulating directing and ennobling care of the great teachers of the age.

There has been a feeling more or less prevalent that the good teacher is the one who can properly care for the lower end of the class, the supposition being that the upper end will take care of itself. In a sense it will. If the whole purpose of education is to bring a youth to the point of graduation from school or col-



lege there is much to be said for this conception of the teacher's duties. It is perfectly true that if you give many a student a text-book and tell him to pass an examination upon it he will do it up to a standard of efficiency which will satisfy the examiner without much effort or special skill on the part of the instructor. It is equally true that to bring the dull or indifferent boy up to this standard requires the exercise of much work and trained powers and nerve-destroying heartburn. But for the latter boy we feel that the effort is well expended and when it succeeds that the teacher is entitled to much glory.

And so he is, but is a school conducted on this basis doing all its duty? Has this bright youth who easily does his stunt and straightway forgets it, who satisfies all the requirements and has an excess of time for loafing or sports, has he received the attention which a true Democracy demands? If he grows up to be a second-rate, common-place sort of a man, instead of a great and beneficial leader in public life or business or the professions or in society or philanthropy, has he had his dues? We have given our best to the poor youth, and the better endowed we have let alone, as if the school record were the end of life and as if his God-given powers relieved us in some way of the responsibility of this development. If we create equality by lifting the lower end and depressing the upper is it anything but a sacrifice to a partial and distorted view of equality?

For does not all nature cry out against such equality? Are not her ways unequal? The great and the small, the wise and the foolish, the strong and the weak, are all born. In every family she strives for differentiation not similarity. Of the million faces that we know all built on the same plan we seldom mistake one for another, while the large proportion of "freaks" make bases for the scientific theories of Darwin and the scientific experiments of Burbank. The prominence of the "common man" may, as Lincoln suggested, prove

that God loved him, yet one Lincoln does more to move the world than many hundreds of medicorities such as ourselves.

But it will be said that Lincoln was a legitimate fruit of our Democratic system. Perhaps so. But he had some special advantages which have mostly disappeared from present American life. He never went to a graded school. He was never taught to believe by inference that a good mark was the great object of education. He placed himself in contact with stimulating and inspiring influences, and if he never had great teachers in the flesh, he had a few great books. It is very questionable whether he could have done much better and whether his life is not an evidence that a special great mind needs special training for a great work.

It is for such minds and spirits that I am trying to plead—men to whom large portions of endowments of mind and character have been given, men who have been laid out on a generous plan, which needs much filling in, to complete up its full proportion. We may not neglect the masses of the unfortunate or the mediocre, but is our Democracy large enough to do justice to this small but, especially in a Democracy, useful and highly productive class? Where there are no privileged classes by birth or legislative enactment, where the rights of all are to be protected, there is the most need for wise and manifest leadership, by representative men who know the temper of Democracy, believe in it, and will show it the way to victory. The average man is not a representative man. The man who stands out to represent a class is a man who should be able to ennoble the class in the world's eyes. If Democracy is to stand up to its duty and be respected and respectable, its exponents must be only its devotees but its intelligent and forceful advocates with great qualities developed to their highest powers.

We do not need to accentuate the difference of rank or wealth or immunity from proper penalties or the

privileges and duties which belong to citizenship or anything else artificial. In all these we need to level up the lower ranks and level down the upper. But the differences which are natural and elemental, which indicate the man's fitness and capacity, these should be accentuated to their fullest extent, and any process of leveling down the man strong in mind and character is fatal to the best development of a nation and no part of a true Democracy. We often blunder along in America trying effete experiments, putting into practice inefficient methods which look good to the average man, but which a clear-sighted and educated leadership would immediately discard. Unhappy is that community which does not have its great leaders or is taught to distrust them if they exist. The undisputed reign of the common man is unscientific, haphazard and unprogressive.

But the evil is more than this. Of course the bright boy loses time but simply leaving a boy two years behind does not count so much at the age of 40. The effect of the lack of tasks which draw out the best powers, which challenge his ambition and excite his will, oftentimes produces a flabbiness and superficiality of mental fibre and a low standard of attainments from which he never recovers. It may be possible to make up the two years handicap in a 20 year race, but it is vastly difficult to re-create the mental machine, to reinforce the enfeebled will, to re-inspire the lost enthusiasm of youth. The young man fresh from the resolves inspired by contact with a great book or a great man, resolves which induce him to consecrate himself to living out the best and greatest that in him lies, to do a man's work in obedience to the behests of the highest laws of his nature, is allowed to fritter away all these noble enthusiasms by the drag of the enforced requirements made necessary by boys who never feel his enthusiasms and whose impulses are wholly negative if not degrading. Is our responsibility fulfilled?

Nor is the choice of a teacher dictated by the popu-

lar judgment always a wise one. One can have great confidence in the intelligent permanent opinion of the best students as to the fitness of a man for his position. But the most gifted of teachers is often not popular, at least for a time. Gladstone tells of a dinner long after his Eton days to the Headmaster of that ancient school. He says that Dr. Keate had administered "the salutary correction of the birch" to almost every one, and that if any of them had been asked during school days what he thought of Dr. Keate he would have answered "Keate, O I hate him." But when he rose to speak the cheering drowned everything, reducing to comparative feebleness all the applause to royalty proviously given. The Doctor was so affected he could do nothing but utter a few incoherent sounds and sit down. It is worth while to have such a durable respect for a master of our boyhood, for it is not all sentiment, but brings along with it an impulse to cherish also the principles which make the man worthy, and which have been to some extent builded into character.

"All that I am I owe to you," said a gushing youth to his old master. "Pray do not mention such a trifle," was the perfectly courteous but perhaps sarcastic reply; and yet in many cases the gratitude is genuine and the statement correct. A master of my boyhood long since dead has many a time in difficult crises been a guide to my actions. How he would have acted and thought has steadied my judgment and determined the result.

Are we losing this too much in America? Are our youth becoming too early mature, too certain of their superior wisdom, too impatient of restraint and advice? Do they carry into life too little of the influence of school days? It is said that the Rugby boys in the English Universities still are recognizable by a certain serious sense of responsibility for conditions in church and state, which is an inheritance of the Arnoldian tradition. If so it is a wonderful tribute to the power of Thomas Arnold and to the character of of Rugby boys.

The old school of the country where youths were taught as individuals and not as a class, if so be that there was a conjunction of an aspiring boy and a stimulating teacher, was perhaps for that boy the best school that ever existed. He was not held back by the average nor tied to a rigid curriculum. But as in Scotland which perhaps produces more great men per capita than other countries, all the magnetic scholarship, the wise direction, the overflowing interest of a devoted soul was transferred to a worthy student, and he could very often say in sober truth in after life, "All that I am I owe to you."

There is no need to decry the general popular control of our Public School System, nor would it be right to thwart the instinctive demand of the national consciousness for the sort of education which will fit the growing man for his proper preparation for life's secular duties. But there is a great need for a body of colleges, preferably small colleges, largely independent of popular control of any sort, which will stand firmly and exclusively on the platform of an education for broad training rather than for technical efficiency; which will omit no part of man's complicated nature; which will be the legitimate heirs of the scholarship of the past; which will keep mercenary considerations in the background; which will always be willing to sacrifice numbers to moral and intellectual quality, buildings to faculty, display to spirit; which will tell the truth about themselves modestly in all announcements; and which will set themselves seriously to the task of rearing a group of men who will be competent to aid in solving some of the great problems of state and church which the next generation has in store for us.



RELATION OF THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM  
TO VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

JAMES R. ANGELL, DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS,  
LITERATURE AND SCIENCE OF THE UNIVER-  
SITY OF CHICAGO.

The problem of vocational education, at least as commonly conceived in the middle west, is not primarily a collegiate issue. It is rather in the high schools and in the secondary system of education as a whole that the matter has been given active consideration. The effort to make the work of our secondary schools articulate more intimately with the actual problems of practical life, with which most of the children upon leaving our high schools are immediately confronted, is one with which I am profoundly sympathetic. Indeed, I do not know how any one adequately informed about the experiences of young people passing from the high schools into commercial and industrial activities, can take any other view. The continuation school, the night school, the technical and industrial high school, the organization of business courses in the ordinary high schools—all these enterprises represent attempts in one fashion or another to deal with the problem mentioned, and all of them must enlist the sympathetic interest of persons concerned for the vitality of our educational process. There are to be sure a few instances in various parts of the country of institutions, such as Simmons College in Boston, and the Carnegie Technical Institute in Pittsburgh, which are attempting on a collegiate level to carry out a definitely vocational program, but broadly speaking, the collegiate problem of vocational education, as this is conceived in connection with secondary education, is only just coming to be recognized by college authorities as significant.

It may be thought that this statement does injustice to the measures adopted by many colleges for permitting students to avail themselves of the later part of their collegiate course for the rudimentary work in a profes-

sional school of law or medicine. It may also be thought to slur unduly the establishment of such institutions as Teachers College at Columbia and the School of Education at Chicago, in which students may combine work for the bachelor's degree with professional training in education. It may also be held to disregard altogether the practice of certain institutions which give a bachelor's degree for work largely pursued in engineering. All this is true, but it is also true that in the academical division of most of our universities, and in most of the small colleges the type of thing which is commonly designated 'vocational education' has only just begun to make itself definitely felt. A few comments may appropriately be made upon the practice just referred to, whereby in certain institutions students are permitted, after completing two or three years of academic work, to enter upon professional studies and at the end of the fourth year of their collegiate work to receive bachelor's degree. It may be remarked that some colleges are permitting their students to migrate to institutions which have professional schools, and on the completion of a year of work in such an institution to receive their bachelor's degree.

The all important motive in countenancing this introduction of professional work into the academic curriculum has been the saving of time. The man who completes his collegiate work twenty-one or twenty-two years of age, follows this with four years of medical training and the year or two of an interne-ship is getting well on toward thirty before he can hope to be self-supporting and in a position to marry. The saving of a year or more is a matter of vital consequence for men of this type, and the social advantages of having well trained men able to establish family life at the normal period has been widely held to justify any reasonable recognition of professional work in an academic curriculum. Of course if it could be shown that there were inevitable sacrifice of quality in this procedure not com-

pensated for by other advantages gained, the question would be still debatable. It seems to be the general impression, however, that the new procedure is on the whole warranted. It may be added that to a considerable extent the actual subject matter of the premedical sciences, which is the field commonly represented where medical work is allowed to invade the academic curriculum, is closely comparable in character to the scientific work which students, candidates for the B. S. Degree, might well be pursuing, even though they were not specifically directed toward the medical career. A similar situation is to some extent involved in the professional work of law and theology. The departure from the older academic requirements is therefore in some cases not so great as might at first sight seem to be the case. Quite a different variety of procedure is represented by organization inside of our academic colleges of courses designed to give a somewhat vocational bent to the training imparted to students. So-called colleges of commerce, of business procedure, and the like are making their appearance. In many instances inspection shows that this movement consists in actual fact simply of the segregation of a group of courses already offered by the institution but with special regard to the training required for definite kinds of occupation. In some instances there has been introduced a good deal of actual material not found in the older college curricula. Courses in household economics, in accounting and the like will illustrate the point. A great deal, however, of the work thus organized had already found a place in university and collegiate curricula and the main difference in the new and old conditions is to be found at two points; first, the grouping and coordinating of the courses with a view to a specific tangible outcome in the way of technical training; and second, the introduction into the conduct of the work of something approaching the professional standards of severity and thoroughness. Perhaps the most extreme form of this tendency is found

in the organization of teachers' colleges already referred to, which may be regarded as definitely professional schools, but whose work is as yet very largely identical with that given in the strictly academic college. The spirit in which the work is done and the point of view from which it is conducted constitute the characteristic differences.

The introduction of vocationalizing curricula into the colleges, to which reference has just been made, has had several motives, of which perhaps the most important has been the desire to make the college course contribute more directly to the effectiveness of the service rendered by graduates in the earlier years of their business and professional life. It has been a common criticism that, however considerable the cultural effects of the ordinary college curriculum, it lacked altogether practical utility, and indeed that to some extent it often unfitted its victims for contact with the world of affairs. It is fair to say that the new movement is still in an experimental stage, and it is not altogether clear to what extent it may actually prove possible to make college work contribute in any direct fashion to the rank and file of occupations outside the learned professions. But the experiment is certainly worth making and has already achieved a measurable degree of success in certain directions.

Another motive which has figured largely in the minds of many persons has been as already indicated the introduction of an element of greater seriousness into the work of the college. The last generation has been greatly disturbed at the extent to which so-called student activities had invaded the life of the average college student, diverting him from his primary obligation to his academic work and in his own thinking often quite overtowering it. It has been hoped that if college work could be given a somewhat obvious bearing upon the practical work of life after graduation it might appeal more forcefully to the student's interest, and it has been

widely felt that if the college course were given this quasi-professional trend it would be possible to hold students to very much more rigorous standards of accomplishment. I think it may be said that on the whole the latter hope has been measurably realized. The former expectation presents a somewhat more problematical situation.

One persistent criticism is always made upon all attempts to introduce professional or vocational elements into collegiate work. It is alleged that such procedure inevitably wrecks the fine spirit of liberal studies which has been the cherished flower of our academic gardens. To introduce motives of a professional character, it is said, must inevitably rob study of its more ennobling characteristics and result in the substitution of a cheap utilitarianism for the more generous spirit of liberal education. The rebuttal to this statement, which presumably has some force, is generally found in the contention that however fine the spirit of liberal study, the average American youth of today in colleges organized on this principle, shows himself obstinately indifferent to the intellectual graces ostensibly arising from a system of this type, and in their place too often is found exhibiting habits of superficiality, idleness and sloth which not only wholly lack nobility, but which are both intellectually and morally demoralizing to the last degree. Anything, it is urged, which will either by inducement or compulsion replace this attitude of thoughtless idle drift with one of more energetic serious endeavor is to be welcomed even though in its attainment it involves some sacrifice of other worthy qualities.

Critics of the professionalizing movement are also disposed to urge that it is premature to invite young people as early as the freshmen or sophomore year to attempt any decision as to what calling they will later follow. No doubt there is something to be said for this position, for it is unquestionably the case that many young



persons are not able at this period of their development to select with certainty and finality the line of work that they will permanently pursue. On the other hand, it is to be urged that the intellectual and moral results are much better when college work is directed toward some definite aim of the vocational or professional type than when it is carried forward simply on the principle of 'drift', or on the basis of fleeting ephemeral intellectual interests. Most of our vocationalizing groups of courses are so arranged that a student may without very great loss of time or energy change from one to another group, at least in the early stages of the process. Attention is often called in this connection to the fact that on the continent young men at least are obliged to make what is substantially a permanent choice of their subsequent work at a period corresponding closely to the end of our sophomore year. In other words, our American practice which has postponed this decision in many cases to a point two years later on is at variance with the best European practice, and the attempt to introduce professional and vocational types of work at or about the middle of our present collegiate course is a movement in the direction of long and well-established practice abroad.

Whether one call the practice vocational or not, it is an interesting fact that the great majority of our American collegiate institutions have for some years proceeded on the basis of a plan which requires students somewhat before the middle of a college course to select for specialized work a group of related subjects. The end in view may be simply the intellectual mastery of the material, but the practical outcome is, often closely similar to that which is sought by the segregation of a group of courses designed to achieve professional or vocational training. The spirit in which the work is carried on may of course vary widely from that of a distinctly liberal non-technical type to one of a narrowly professional sort. But the subject matter in the two

cases, and even the actual organization of the courses may be highly similar.

In conclusion it may well be urged that at the present time we need every possible contribution to our outlook on educational problems which can be given by well considered experiment. In consequence we ought to welcome every institution that presents a well conceived scheme which it proposes conscientiously to work out. Surely we have not yet come to the point where we can with propriety insist that all institutions shall comply with any single standard. Variety is at present immensely desirable. Superficiality and false pretense is everywhere intolerable, but sincerity, earnestness and serious experiment ought to be encouraged. The old fashioned classical college may be the best that can be organized for the training of the finest type of youth. On the other hand, the vocationalizing college may prove to produce results different in kind, but quite as valuable. We should certainly be tolerant in this generation of both varieties and of every intermediate type.

---

### DISCUSSION.

WILLIAM A. MILLIS, PRESIDENT OF HANOVER COLLEGE.

In my thinking of the relation of the curriculum to the liberal arts college to industrial education, and in particular to what is popularly called vocational training, four conceptions stand out prominently.

First, it is not the primary business of the liberal arts college to provide for vocational training as such. Pre-vocational courses, such as the standardized pre-medical course, should be provided, and local conditions may make it legitimate and desirable to give courses in education, household economy, and similar activities having a large social significance for the immediate vicinity. Education is a function of all the people and so vit-

ally related to all other social activities that provision of such training would seem to be demanded of the institution which wishes to relate itself directly to the larger life of the people, but such courses should not undertake the technical work of the normal school. Those colleges which serve a distinctively rural constituency may properly offer instruction in such courses as will equip the youth going back to the farm for rural leadership, but again this instruction should not attempt to duplicate the work of the agricultural school either in subject matter or method. All institutions receiving young women should give such courses in home-making as will look toward improvement of family life in our country. Beyond such courses as these, looking primarily to general social betterment, the college should not invade the province of the technical school.

Second, I think it is clearly the business of the college to help the student relate himself as definitely as possible as a social factor. To this end the curriculum should make ample provision for Vocational Guidance.

Third, it is the business of the college to provide a corrective for the peculiar mental re-action of a distinctively vocational education, becoming almost a defect of the American mind, by emphasis of studies of a philosophical character, by developing a critical mind-ness and a wholesome idealism, and by fostering the theoretic as distinguished from the practical spirit.

Fourth, the essential difference between technical and liberal education must be kept in mind, for there are essential differences. All education is for increase of life quantitatively and qualitatively, and must comprise both liberal and technical training. These varieties of training must be regarded not as kinds or varieties of education, but as corordinate phases of the educational process. A man is not educated unless he has both. A degree of over-lapping of the two is unavoidable—in fact is desirable. Hard and fast distinctions can not and need not be drawn. Yet, on the whole, the tech-

nical school equips the individual for a particular activity or calling, and is concerned with him primarily as a practitioner and, economically, as a producer. On the other hand, the liberal arts college seeks to equip him for independent judgment and an active adjustment of himself in all of the relationships which as a man he must sustain. It looks towards the freedom of the individual in the sense in which the older German pedagogy used that term. In this function, it has a part with the elementary and secondary schools. They give the individual training for the arts common to all the people. The liberal arts college continues this service in that it looks to the equipment of the individual for a rational participation in all of those activities which are common to all of the people.

The college seeks to give this larger equipment in two ways: first, by rationalizing these activities for the individual; second, by training his will with reference to the whole of life as distinguished from the small segment of it coming within the purview of the technical school. The college rationalizes the activities of life by giving the student a conception of the ideas which underlie and govern each of them; by developing a conception of the unity which these several activities constitute, and of the interrelations which subsists among them; and by giving insight into the significance of each of them for life. This phase of college education should function in the form of a set of well defined standards of judgment together with the habit of independent rational judgment.

The second phase of liberal education seeks to train the Will for the Whole of life. This it accomplishes in so far as it gives a zest for complete living, a vigorous and well coordinated interest in all activities; by developing the socialized as distinguished from the "trades union" conscience; and, crowning all educational effort, by nurturing a positive and hearty faith.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE OF  
OFFICE.HERBERT WELCH, PRESIDENT OF OHIO WESLEYAN  
UNIVERSITY.

This is a question to which there are not simply two sides, but twenty. It can scarcely be argued to a conclusion. The opinion which one holds is likely to be the result not so much of a deliberate process of reasoning as of his entire experience. The most that anyone, therefore, can do in such a discussion is to suggest some of the considerations which lie back of any reasoned feeling on the subject, to express his own opinion concerning it, and to exercise towards divergent views the same charity which he claims from those who differ with him.

Perhaps no company of men is on the whole so well prepared to consider this topic fairly as a company of college presidents. A body of trustees sees the social, the administrative side of it; a body of professors or even of alumni may be inclined to ignore any but the individual and theoretical aspects. But college presidents share with the trustees the sense of responsibility for the institutional life; they are not unaware of finances and constituencies and influences and impressions and historical precedents and traditions. On the other hand, they are themselves as vitally concerned as the professors in the personal applications, for their own utterances are effected by the same restrictions, if any exist. It is the president as well as the professor who has sometimes found his position untenable because of his expressed views.

Without attempting any historical review, may I remind you that in earlier days the points of greatest sensitiveness in university teaching were theological. Even when the debate was over the Ptolemaic and Copernican theories of the universe, the supposed theological bearing of those theories was the crux, and Galileo was a sufferer at the hands of the church. The con-



licts between magic and chemistry, fiat creation and evolution, while scientific problems, were inextricably bound up with current religious teaching. The precise nature of the Bible may be historical and literary questions, but the consideration which has made its discussion intense and bitter was the religious values involved. There have been many false alarms, many fightings of supposed foes; and the gradual attainment of such freedom of belief and speech as we have, has been against the opposition of some very sincere and well-meaning opponents. The conflict has gone through the physical and the geological sciences, with their theological interest, and at last into the social sciences. The field of battle has shifted; the battle itself has not ended. Within the past twenty years many cases have come to public notice where the claims of freedom and progress on the one side and caution and authority on the other have clashed resoundingly. The names of the Universities of Chicago, Stanford, Wisconsin, Montana, Colorado, Oklahoma, Utah and Pennsylvania, to mention no others, will readily occur to the mind. And in nearly all of these cases, it is in the field of economics, sociology, and political science that the trouble has arisen. Some take the situation seriously, not to say tragically, assuring us that the issue is "democracy vs autocracy", and that the rising tide of professional and public indignation is about to sweep from their antiquated and rather shaky thrones the tyrant presidents and trustees whose reign has been one of mingled wickedness and imbecility. Others, less excited, still see impending changes in the theory and method of university administration of no slight significance, and believe that we are just now taking an additional and important step towards ultimate justice and wisdom.

To discuss in detail all or any of these cases (as has recently been done in the case of Utah, in the very interesting, somewhat amusing, and sometimes irritating pamphlet of the committee of American University

Professors would here be foolish and impossible. I should like to remark, however, that, after all, there has been astonishingly little interference with academic freedom either by private donors or by noble officials. We must remember the temptations of wealth and of political power to arrogance; we must recall the plausible argument that "support implies and should imply"; we must bear in mind the necessities of maintenance and growth, and then the many causes appealing to those who have money at their disposal and their undoubted right to use those funds where, in their judgment, they shall be most wisely administered (in other words, employed for the purposes in which their donors chiefly believe). With these and like facts in mind, we shall count it not so strange that there have been some attempts at undue control, as that there have not been more such attempts. Indeed I am inclined to think that those are right who have suggested that the evil of removing competent and fit men from academic positions has been, in the total, far less harmful in its effects on education than the retention of incompetent and unfit men. Theoretically, security of tenure of office must be sought; practically, there has in a certain class of cases been too great security; and as President Butler has pointed out, mediocrity and efficiency are often sheltered by regard for academic rights and dignity. This fact, however, does not render less imperative a frank facing of the whole problem.

Now, it must be admitted that from one point of view—namely, that of legal and perhaps moral right—an institution is privileged to make any restrictions or establish any standards which it pleases, provided they are frankly made known. Doubtless all will agree, nevertheless, that to make restrictions or establish standards which are petty, sectarian, partisan, is not likely to benefit the institution or others concerned. Yet, even without special restrictions, unquestionable in choosing new members of the faculty all the items which

affect the desirability of a man for the particular post may rightly be taken into account. Certainly the effort should not be to secure men all of one type, with a dull uniformity of view, of character, or of method. But as between different men, to none of whom the institution has as yet any relation or obligation, personal habits, correctness of speech, neatness of dress, affability, family connections, with the broader question of intellectual attitude, religious sympathies—anything which seems to make a particular man more or less adapted for usefulness in the varied duties of the college life—all are proper subjects of consideration and items to be weighed in a decision. Careless and hasty and blundering choices may account for much of later trouble.

When, however, the man has been engaged and has served on the teaching staff, the case is to a degree altered. You may not be willing to admit that he has acquired any vested right to his position but if we are asking men to do more than give us so many hours of instruction for so much salary; if we are urging them to give their interest, their loyalty to the institution, to identify themselves with it, to pour into it something of their lives, then we must be prepared to meet them in a similarly cordial spirit, and to treat them as friends, as partners in a common enterprise, rather than as hirelings who may be waived lightly aside. Especially in the case of those who occupy the higher ranks of Professor and Associate Professor should procedure be cautious and kind, and displacement occur only for serious cause.

This does not mean that the college has entered into a relationship where its hands are tied, where the freedom of the instructor is supreme and the freedom of the college abolished. It certainly does not mean that the instructor, having reached one of these more established and permanent appointments, is henceforth free from all restraints and may without protest or interference from the college speak and act as he will. All

freedom is limited by the rights of others. The freedom of speech which the private citizen claims, the freedom of the press which is our boast, are, after all, only relative. There are bounds beyond which the law will not permit one to pass with impunity. And even the rights of the ordinary individual are partly surrendered by the man in public office. Declarations, criticisms, praises which the private citizen of the United States might freely utter would be highly improper in these troublous times from the President. "The White man's burden", the burden of civilization, the burden which the strong must bear for the weak, the wise for the ignorant, grows heavier as one ascends in the scale of office and responsibility. No man has a right to enter a public or semi-public position unless he is willing to submit to the limitations which his position imposes. The man may be before the officer; yet sometimes the officer does not well to exercise all the rights of the man. So with the teacher. He assumes new responsibilities with his new position. If there are special and local limitations, they should be clearly made known; but there are in every case general limitations relating to morality, efficiency, and expediency which cannot be defined except in rather vague terms, yet which should everywhere be assumed. No college makes rules forbidding its students to plow up the campus or remove the foundations from beneath its buildings. Some things must always be taken as understood.

One of these things, I take it, is this: that the whole field of knowledge is not open, in the sense of being unexplored and unoccupied. Some things are by now fairly well located. The individual may have to retrace, from the embryo to full manhood, the various steps, physical, intelligent, religious, by which the race has thus far come to its own. But we do not expect an instructor to go through that evolutionary process in residence. Such work should be taken *in absentia*. The institution should certainly not be compelled with

the coming of each new instructor to travel once more the weary path which leads up to our present civilization. We live not in the tenth century but in the twentieth. We must build on the foundations which others have laid. Society may safely take some things as settled. A few things in history, for example, are scarcely open to question. If some young doctor of philosophy who believes himself in his research work to have lighted upon certain new and revolutionary canons of historical criticism should (to take an absurd yet classic instance) announce and proceed to prove that Napoleon never really existed at all, we should doubtless all feel mildly disposed not to extend his term, but to say to him, "Not here, dear fellow. Our students have but a few years to spend with us, and we cannot fritter away their time or expose them willingly to the contagion of such erratic mental processes." In political science we may take for granted that some form of organized government should rightfully obtain; and the teaching of anarchy would clearly disqualify the teacher in any American college. In sociology we have the right to assume the institution of the family, to take monogamy as established, and to expect that no teacher shall advocate any plan of free love, or trial marriage, or polygamy. And, speaking at least for the avowedly Christian colleges, I should say that it is equally true that we take for granted the Christian system as a whole—the Christian standard of morality for the individual, the Christian interpretation of history, the Christian philosophy of the universe, the Christian ideal as the basis of the social organization which we seek to build. It is sometimes asserted that the true college and university stand for nothing but the pursuit and the teaching of truth, that no boundaries can be put about allowable research and instruction. But the assertion is indefinite and indeed misleading. We stand not only for the search for truth but for the belief that some truth has really been discovered and put beyond



reasonable controversy. I dislike the use of the words "sectarian" and "proprietary" in this connection. They bring with them an atmosphere of odium which it is desirable to avoid. But whatever the adjectives which may be employed, I for one am perfectly ready to admit and to claim that we do stand for something definite, something which may fairly be called a propaganda. We cannot be expected to be neutral as between atheism and theism, between Judaism or ethical culture and Christianity. We can but regard some things as working hypotheses so widely accepted as to discredit cruder or contradictory conceptions. Of course our minds are forever to be open to new light; we are never to be astonished at the appearance of something higher, finer, diviner. But as between the best knowledge of the present and what is now generally recognized in scholarship and practice as lower, every institution does make some assumptions and fix some standards.

On the other hand, it seems to me equally clear that many of our current controversies must be held within the range of doubt and unfettered discussion. For instance, the divorce question, the relative desirability of a monarchy and a republic, widely varying interpretations of the Christian facts, the whole puzzle of our industrial organization—our capitalistic civilization (as it is called), competition as a general principle of trade, the wage system—to say nothing of such delicate questions as the ability and efficiency of the President of the University or even the officers or Board of Trustees—these and a thousand more plainly give room for largest differences of opinion.

But that there is also a twilight zone to be discerned here, is not less evident. In fact some of the questions I have mentioned as clearly on one side or the other might be located by some of those here present in the natural or disputed territory between. I am not, however, so much concerned to draw the exact boundary lines as to point out that there are boundary lines—that there are

and must be limits to any academic freedom. And this all really admit when the question is pressed. The committee on the Utah case agreed that even criticisms of the University and its administration, "if exaggerated, habitual, and flippant or malignant in tone", might give ground for serious discipline. The trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, after adopting Huxley's broad declaration of intellectual independence, proceeded to grant freedom of speech to their professors when it was exercised "in a proper manner, upon proper occasions, and with proper respect for the dignity of their relationship to the University". Even President Butler in his article in the *Educational Review*, after a bold and unqualified assertion of academic freedom, goes on to say that it must be practiced within the limits of common morality, common sense, common loyalty, and a decent respect for the opinion of mankind—and when one stops to think of it, these are genuine limitations. Where others have succeeded in entangling themselves in apparant contradictions or losing themselves in obscurities, it behooves me to tread softly. But I would say bluntly again—freedom is always only relative and in all civilized society must be exercised within limits, with due regard for the claims of others.

For one thing, an institution has its rights as well as a man, and one of those rights is the right to continuity of life. It must not be governed by a dead hand; tradition and precedent must not preclude progress; but the institution has a right to advance according to its own genius.

Again, academic freedom is to be regulated by sound pedagogy. The wise instructor seeks to impart the truth as the mind of the student is prepared for the truth; arithmetic must come before algebra, language before literature. And when the instructor has finished with a student, if he be indeed a worthy teacher, he will say at the end, like the greatest of teachers, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot

bear them now." I am fully persuaded that most of the complaints concerning unsound and unsafe teaching, where they are not sheer misreport or misunderstanding, come from a faulty method of teaching rather than from fundamentally dangerous views. A failure to appreciate one's audience, and inability to put oneself into the student's place, a belligerent attitude, a cynical delight in shocking crude and unsophisticated thinkers, a lack of reverence for the beliefs of others, a poor form of statement—these explain many of the difficulties between instructors and university authorities.

Once more, the right to a due freedom of opinion and speech is sometimes confused with the right to use an institution for one's platform in proclaiming those views. If an instructor finds himself clean out of sympathy with the unrecognized fundamental teachings and practices of his college, it is clearly his duty as an honorable man to resign. He must not sacrifice his own convictions and be cowardly, evasive, or insincere; but for his own happiness and for his own largest usefulness he must be where there is harmony between himself and the institution which he serves. If he remains under these circumstances, he cannot be amazed if it is made plain that he has duties corresponding with his rights. This very phrase is taken from the recent report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the American Association of University Professors—a report which, even if its logic is not at every point convincing, is yet admirably balanced and indisputable, as it seems to me, in its general conclusions. Indeed I might well buttress the statements I have just been making by quoting a few sentences from that report:

"The liberty of the scholar within the university to set forth his conclusions, be they what they may, is conditioned by their being conclusions gained by a scholar's method and held in a scholar's spirit; that is to say, they must be the fruits of competent and patient and sincere inquiry, and they should be set forth with

dignity, courtesy, and temperateness of language. The university teacher, in giving instruction upon controversial matters, should be a person of a fair and judicious mind \* \* \* \* Something must be done to prevent the freedom which is claimed in the name of science from being used as a shelter for inefficiency, for superficiality, or for uncritical and intemperate partisanship \* \* \* \* There is one case in which the academic teacher is under an obligation to observe certain special restraints—namely, the instruction of immature students \* \* \* \* It may reasonably be expected that the instructor will present scientific truth with discretion, that he will introduce the student to new conceptions gradually, with some consideration for the student's preconceptions and traditions, and with due regard to character-building." It is indeed important to stimulate thinking on the part of the students; but it is "possible and necessary that such intellectual awakening be brought about with patience, considerateness, and pedagogical wisdom \* \* \* It is, it will be seen, in no sense the contention of this committee that academic freedom implies that individual teachers should be exempt from all restraints as to the matter or manner of their utterances, either within or without the university. Such restraints as are necessary should in the main, your committee holds, be self-imposed, or enforced by the public opinion of the profession. But there may, undoubtedly arise occasional cases in which the aberrations of individuals may require to be checked by definite disciplinary action. What this report chiefly maintains is that such action cannot with safety be taken by bodies not composed of members of the academic profession \* \* \* \* It is, in short, not the absolute freedom of utterance of the individual scholar, but the absolute freedom of thought, of inquiry, of discussion and of teaching, of the academic profession that is asserted by this declaration of principles."

This last quotation raises naturally the further ques-

tion: if it be granted that some limits are to be set about academic freedom, by whom shall they be established and guarded? To leave the matter entirely to each individual concerned is obviously to return to anarchy. A state of society in which every man does that which is right in his own eyes, is a state in which none of us would desire to live. Individualism run wild is no vindication of freedom, but its sure destruction. If the true limits of academic freedom can be self-imposed and self-enforced, happy will be the institutions; but some authority superior to the individual must exist to care for the abnormal and happily rare case. All that I understand the Association of University Professors to ask is that this authority shall be professional rather than lay authority, that decisions as to competence and personal fitness shall be made by the faculty instead of the trustees. This is organized and collective self-government, which is quite another affair from individual license.

But before coming directly to this question of method let us remind ourselves of the objects which any method should seek to achieve. There is for one thing the dignity of the academic calling. The high importance of this body of college and university teachers to the welfare of the republic must never be forgotten. Whatever will discourage men of strength and independence from entering or continuing in the profession is to be deplored. As partial compensation for small salaries in return for large services, they should receive generous recognition of the dignity of their calling. If they are to be regarded as nothing more than employees of small groups of business men who are to dictate their utterances and discharge them on any whim, we can scarcely wonder if weak and servile men should predominate. But if they are appointees rather than employees, co-ordinate with the trustees in some functions, independent of the trustees in others; if they are regarded as in somewhat the same position as judges on the



bench, appointed but not dictated to by another authority; then men of blood and brain may keep their self-respect while serving their constituency and their country in such places of trust.

As a part of this comes security of tenure, "not", as one has well put it, "as a personal privilege, but as an expedient, far-sighted public policy". To be held to one's obligations, but not to be subject to sudden, violent removal, the outcome of personal prejudice or personal spite, is essential to the dignity and proper security of the professor. Fair terms of office should be provided for, and it is likely that in certain ranks or after a certain time election ought to be for an indefinite period.

There are, moreover, the interests of the institution itself to protect. If the best teachers are likely to be lost; if their words, because of real or supposed constraint, lost weight, if the respect of the truth-loving community is forfeited; the loss to the students and to the institution as a whole will be real and vital. The college which is party to the stifling of newly-discovered truth is fighting the very stars in their courses and is dooming itself to feebleness and futility.

When it comes to the formulation of a method by which the rights of the individual instructor and of the institution and the society for which it stands may alike be guarded, no one can with any confidence present a completed scheme. In general terms it may be suggested that purely educational questions should be handled by the faculty, purely financial matters by the trustees, and those which involve both educational and financial considerations by both sides; and it might conceivably be wise to have the faculty represented in the Board of Trustees by one or more members elected by themselves. The critical question is the manner of the appointment, re-appointment, promotion, retirement, or dismissal of members of the teaching staff. The extreme view on one side is that which has been common prac-

tice, that such matters should be altogether in the hands of the President and the Trustees. The other extreme is expressed by Professor Lovejoy of Johns Hopkins, who claims that, except for purely financial and property interests, the faculty should be a self-governing republic of scholars, electing their own president, making their own appointments, promotions, etc., distributing the lump sums appropriated by the trustees for salaries, determining all academic honors, and deciding upon the acceptance of proffered gifts. From recent discussions a few suggestions may be gathered which seem to satisfy the demands of both equity and efficiency:

1. The faculty should have part in consideration of appointments and removals. The growth of the democratic principle in state and church and industry points to that as a reasonable course. It may be accomplished through the university or academic council as a whole or through some committee appointed either by the body itself or by the president. This would create a jury of one's peers. It would give the advantage of professional and to some extent expert advice. It would lessen the probability of action based on personal motives. It would thus protect the instructor and give him a sense of security from the operation of chance or malice.

2. There should be removal only for good cause. This might include other considerations when a serious failure as an instructor or serious fault as a man. But the higher the rank of the instructor and the longer his service to the institution, the more urgent should be the reason which would justify his removal.

3. Due notice should be given of an intention to dismiss, not be reappoint, or to continue on sufferance. Except in cases of grave moral delinquency, it would seem fair that this should be at least three months in all cases and perhaps in some much more than that time.

4. When desired by the instructor, there should be provision for a full and judicial hearing of his case.

He should be enabled to present his side to both faculty and trustees. In some places a joint committee from the two bodies serve best for such conference and hearing. In extreme cases, as a last resort, an outside committee might be invited to hear the case and give judgment on its merits. Until some such plan shall be arranged by the institutions themselves, it is likely that we shall have a continuance of the present unsatisfactory and unjust plan of investigations by outside committees, self-appointed or appointed by educational societies. These are not wholly free from a suspicion of bias. They are responsible to no one, they have no power to compel the attendance or testimony of witnesses, they are necessarily ignorant of local conditions, without a knowledge of which the case can scarcely be understood, and their published conclusions, no matter how disputable, are widely distributed and cannot easily be controverted in many quarters. When reasonable plans are provided by the institutions themselves for full investigations and hearings in disputed cases, the excuse for these irregular outside committees will disappear.

5. Final authority for action in these cases should inhere in the trustees. Professor Warren of Princeton contends that as physicians, lawyers and clergymen are responsible only to members of their own craft, so teachers should have their responsibility to teachers and not to laymen. But it must be remembered that the question decided by the craft is whether the person is to have any continued professional standing, any right thereafter to practice his craft at all. The question whether he shall be employed in this place or that is generally decided in all crafts largely by laymen. In the case of the college the trustees, as the legally responsible body, as the representatives (if properly chosen) of the constituency of the college, should be the party to decide, after all hearings and conferences, what action shall be taken. One final authority in the institution there must be. A divided responsibility might mean

conflict and confusion. The pressure of public opinion may be trusted to help in guarding against injustice.

In the solution of these problems the personal element can never be ignored. Whatever the plan adopted, much will depend upon the personality of the president. If he be kindly, fair, and sagacious, able to detach himself from personal considerations, there is always promise for that sense of comfort, security, freedom, and loyalty which brings contentment to the instructor; and at the same time the interests of students and the obligations of the faculty to society will not be lost sight of or neglected. He is the key man in a situation which is theoretically complex and often practically difficult.

But out of all the debate a better method of administration is sure to come, a larger measure of justice to instructors, of safety to institutions, and of mutual understanding, and good-will between President and Trustees and Faculty.

---

#### DISCUSSION.

U. G. WEATHERLY, PROFESSOR IN INDIANA UNIVERSITY.

Mr. President and gentlemen: The very able and instructive paper of President Welch has already brought forth much of the real contents of the report of the committee. It remains for me, therefore, merely to emphasize certain features in a little more detail and to suggest one or two of the special points of interest which the committee has had in mind in its report.

First, a brief historical word. Two years ago at the meeting in Minneapolis of the American Economic Association, the American Sociological Society and the American Political Science Association, there was passed a joint resolution providing that each of the three societies should appoint a committee of three on academic freedom and academic tenure. This action was called forth by the fact that there had been two recent cases

of supposed infringement of academic freedom affecting members of two of these societies. These committees were appointed and when they met constituted themselves a joint committee of nine. That committee acted for one year as the representatives of these three societies, and reported at the meetings of the societies a year ago setting forth some preliminary conclusions. At that time there was organized in New York the Association of American University Professors. When this latter association was constituted one of the first things it did was to provide for a committee on academic freedom and tenure, and inasmuch as our joint committee was already in the field and inasmuch as the three disciplines which this committee represented were those most likely to be effected in cases of dispute over academic freedom, the Association decided to adopt this joint committee as its own. In pursuance of that action the President of the Association added some additional members, making a committee of fifteen, which during the past year has been the committee which has been dealing with this problem of academic freedom and tenure. It happened by some strange coincidence after the appointment of the larger committee and after the beginning of its work that there came a sort of epidemic of academic troubles. Whether this was a mere coincidence or whether it resulted from anything connected with this movement on the part of the American university professors it would be hard to determine. It nevertheless is true that the past calendar year has been perhaps one of the most marked in the history of American education for the occurrence of academic friction. The most conspicuous of those cases are the ones connected with the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Utah, the University of Colorado and the University of Montana. We had before our committee, left over from the previous year, really as one of the causes for the original constitution of the committee, a case from Wesleyan University, upon which we have



made a final report at the recent meeting of the committee in Washington.

So much for the historical development of this movement on the part of the American University Professors Association. This committee during the past year has had to deal with all these special and conspicuous cases as well as with a large number of less conspicuous cases and the report which we have finally made has grown not only out of the general study of the problems of academic freedom and tenure but also to some extent out of the actual results of our investigation of these special cases.

Supplementing what has been said by President Welch, I may say that the committee has assumed that there are three great functions which an institution of higher learning may undertake and which most of them are undertaking. These functions are research, teaching and the preparation of experts for the public service. In regard to research, there are found to be very few cases of real academic friction. Most institutions of higher learning now recognize that investigation is a function which must not be hampered and in most cases it is not hampered. It is recognized, as I have stated in a paper which I published on this subject a year ago, that the investigator should be given a roving commission to find out any secret which he can discover. It is within the province of teaching that most of the friction occurs inside of the institution. The Committee's report confirms the conclusion reached in Dr. Welch's paper, that there are certain necessary restrictions on teaching conditioned by the nature of the students taught, by the nature of the subjects, by the nature of the social relationships involved in the institution and what might be called the social staging of the institution. All of these are very material and very wise limitations upon freedom of teaching. I suppose that not even the most radical advocates of academic freedom contend that there should be restrictions. One of the central points in our

conclusion is that part which is summed up in the sentence, "There are no rights without duties." Our emphasis has been very clear upon the point that the rights of freedom which university scholars may claim are rights which are always conditioned by the restriction of good sense, good judgment and the social environment in which the teaching takes place. Further, upon the disputed point as to where academic authority ultimately rests our committee has come to a definite conclusion. We did not undertake to investigate the much disputed problem of a larger participation of the faculty in university and college administration. That did not fall within our province. Nevertheless we had to skirt the edges of the question in setting forth the fundamental basis of academic authority, because, if the right of dismissal is to rest wholly in the hands of the trustees then we must recognize that the trustees are the absolute and final authority in all stages of university administration. Now, the contention of the committee is emphatically that the final authority in regard to the function of teaching and research inheres naturally in the body of scholars who are engaged in teaching and research; that the president of the university or the trustees of the university hold to the teachers in the various disciplines essentially the same relation that the President of the United States holds to Federal Judges. The President has the appointing power, indeed, but he has no responsibility for the decisions of judges whom he has appointed. Similarly it is contended that the trustees of a given institution are in the position of having appointing power as the agents of society which they represent and which the institutions under their charge represents, but the administration of that function after it is once conferred lies in the hands of the body of scholars who exercise it, just as the interpretation of the law lies in the hands of the judges.

One point which we have emphasized particularly is the fact that practically all institutions as they exist

in America at the present time are, whatever their character, or name, are really in the long run dependent upon and responsible to society at large. We have very few institutions which are strictly sectarian or private in character. There are very few institutions which do not appeal to the general body of the public as the promoters of human culture and of general education. Now, we take the position that in making that appeal, they class themselves as institutions under social control. In so far therefore, as the trustees are the managers of such institutions they are in a real sense responsible to society as a whole and we have insisted that institutions which do not care to be so regarded shall make clear the particular set of doctrines which they stand for or the particular character of the teaching which they insist upon, in order that the public may understand clearly what it is asked to support. In the case of the state university the case is quite clear. The trustees in that case are the clearly recognized organs of society in the administration of the institutions.

I want to emphasize still further an important fact which our committee has dealt with at some length and which President Welch has discussed very clearly, the matter of extramural utterances and activities. This after all is one of the most difficult, as it is one of the most common causes of friction. I think I am correct in saying that it has not been oftenest that serious cases of academic friction have occurred on account of class room lecturing or teaching. There have been some cases, but if you will take the trouble to investigate them, the conspicuous cases and the far more numerous class of cases will be found to have arisen out of extramural utterances and activities. And that raises the very serious question about which I think none of us are prepared to give any absolute and categorical answer, as to what are the limitations to be placed upon extramural activities of college and university teachers. The committee considered the question, for instance, as to

whether we should incorporate in our report a declaration deprecating the participation of academic teachers in political movements of a propagandist character.

In a paper which I read a year ago before the American Sociological Society I ventured to dissent from the opinion of most of my colleagues by frankly declaring my doubt as to the wisdom of academic teachers taking an active part in purely partisan political movements. I hold this view not because they have not a full right as citizens to do so, for there can be no debate on that, nor because it is dangerous and likely to make trouble—I believe if the thing were right we could afford to face any danger and any difficulty and ought not to hedge—but because engaging in partisan political movements is likely to interfere with the scientific cast of mind, to divert one's interests in social problems from the clear and uncontaminated search for truth to the partisan attitude of the propagandist. Members of our committee differed on that point and, as you will find, we gave in the end a rather non-committal answer in view of the disagreement among ourselves. It is one of the most difficult questions to decide because just as long as we advise against participation in partisan movements and public activities of a propagandist character, just so long we seem to impose an unnatural and unjust limitation upon academic teachers as citizens and as members of society. Nay, it is alleged by those who oppose restriction, we shut off from the active service of society exactly those trained men who are best fitted to serve it. But the committee was able to agree in the view that it is not wise for university professors as a general thing to engage in movements where they are candidates for office or to take a conspicuous part in party leadership on a wide scale. We have made an exception in our recommendation in regard to local administrative offices or those of a character which are not strictly partisan or political, like service on commissions or any form of public service which involves the bringing of expert

knowledge and ability to the service of the state in fields which are not controversial.

I pass to the recommendation which the committee has made for some definite provisions which it believes the Association of American University Professors should adopt in order to safeguard the interests of academic freedom and to guarantee a reasonably secure tenure of the academic office. President Welch has outlined the recommendations that the Committee made at the end of its report. We have proposed that there shall be action by a faculty committee in all cases of re-appointment. That is, there shall be no dropping of men from faculties who are on limited terms of appointment without the recommendation of some faculty committee. We have suggested to the Association that it recommend to the American universities the adoption of a definite policy in regard to appointment to positions so that those appointed to such offices may know when they are appointed what they may expect for the future. And we have recommended further that in the case of the higher grades there shall be no dismissal without one year's notice. In the case of instructors, there shall be no discontinuance of the appointment without three months of notice. One of the most serious charges made in some of the recent conspicuous cases was that the notice of the non-renewal of appointment was not until just at the end of the year when there was no opportunity for securing an academic position for the coming year. We have recommended, in the third place, that the university authorities shall formulate and state definitely the grounds upon which they will in the future dismiss members of the faculty. Our committee has preferred, not to formulate the proper grounds for dismissal itself, but has left that to the institutions. We have merely recommended that they shall each adopt some very definite program as to what may be expected as a cause for dismissal. We have recommended in the fourth place that there shall be no dismissal without ju-



dicial hearing. Such judicial hearings, as I think you will find the final draft of the report will show, shall be before a joint board of trustees and members of the faculty at which the accused shall have the right to present evidence and to have a fair and full hearing. In preparing the final draft of our report we decided that this should mean that the accused should have the right to present not only the evidence of his own colleagues in his own department as to his efficiency and standing, but that he should have the right if he so desired to present the opinions of his colleagues in his science in other institutions. The most competent judges of scientific work are not always the men in one's own department in his own institution. Nay, for reasons of human nature which most of us know too well, one's local colleagues may be the least competent judges on account of local or personal jealousies.

I believe all of us on the Committee recognize fully the force of the claim that the mere holding of an academic position ought not necessarily to be presumptive evidence that a man should continue to hold it; that there are certain limitations upon the right of academic teachers which pertain not alone to those scientific qualifications which I have already mentioned but to matters of personal character and personal fitness. One of the most striking things in the whole situation is found in what President Pritchett said to us when he met with our committee a year ago. He said that he was constantly besieged by presidents of universities and colleges with requests for counsel and consolation in the very difficult problem of dealing with the "impossible" man. "We simply can't get along with him. What shall we do?" President Pritchett said his invariable advice in such cases was, "You must get along with him."

Not all of us perhaps would go so far as President Pritchett in this regard. Every sensible man must recognize that there are certain degrees of incompatibility

which become so unendurable that, for the benefit of all concerned there should be a discontinuance of relations; but this discontinuance need not take a violent form in most cases. Our committee certainly does not insist on the inviolability of academic tenure, rather it insists on a definite, precise, well formulated mode of procedure with reference to the severance of academic relations. And let me emphasize an element in the situation which the committee deems most important of all. One of the big things which the Association of American University Professors can do and is going to do is to insist upon adequate and proper standards for admission to the profession and to establish and ascertain high standards for its members. One of its functions is the appointment of a committee on professional ethics corresponding to those of the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association. I believe that that is going to do more than anything else not only to prevent much of the friction which we have had in the past and also to elevate and dignify the academic calling in America.

---

## DISCUSSION

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN, PRESIDENT OF AMHERST COLLEGE.

Ladies and gentlemen: I am too new at the business of being a college president to have anything very definite to say this morning and I have too recently come from the ranks of the college professors into the ranks of the college presidents to be sure on which side of controverted issues I stand. I found myself in rather hearty disagreement with something that President Welch said with regard to the limitation of the field of academic instruction. I can see that any given institutions may limit the questions to be discussed within its walls. That is, of course, a matter of choice. But I should be very sorry to see such an arbitrary choice of a few institutions interpreted as a general

academic principle applicable to all institutions. In a certain sense one may accept Mr. Welch's statement regarding matters which are "beyond reasonable controversy." Men ought not to discuss problems which it is not reasonable to consider. But how are we to determine whether or not a matter is within the limits of "reasonable controversy?" I protest that there is only one proper working test, viz., that whatever reasonable men have controversy about is matter of reasonable controversy. If we have the right men on our faculties, men who are intelligent and reasonable in their teaching, it is a needless and unjustifiable interference to tell them what subjects may or may not be considered by them. The real question is not one of subjects but of men. I should be very sorry to find some of our colleges at least saying to their teachers, "This matter which seems to you to demand consideration is not to be considered; this opinion which you question is not to be questioned." It was suggested that it is not fair to students to lead them into certain problems and perplexities of thought. As against this I protest that the one essentially unfair procedure of an intellectual institution is to represent to a student that he is being honestly and fully introduced into the realm of thinking when he is in reality being led by the nose to some fixed and determined conclusion which, for some reason or other, it is regarded as important for him to believe.

The problem of academic freedom, presented by the Report of the Committee of the Association of University Professors, is not for most of us terribly important when it does come to an issue. I must confess that if my conception of the liberal college were that presented by Dean Angell last night I should not feel much disturbed about academic freedom. If our liberal colleges were without definite principles or policy, if they had only wavering, wandering views of the work they have to do, if there were no definite task for which they are responsible, I should not care very much whether they were free or not. But as against Mr. Angell's notion, the liberal college seems

to me to have just now a very concrete and very important part to play in our common life. It is primarily the place for the disinterested, objective consideration of the fundamental issues of our common living, not simply a school for teaching boys but an active force for determining and guiding the intellectual life of a people with regard to the matters which are most significant and vital in its purposes and activities. For such an institution, academic freedom is a necessity of its being.

With regard to the Report, presented by Professor Weatherley, I must confess a certain disappointment—that it does not go far enough, does not treat its task seriously enough. Instead of a discussion of the real issue of academic freedom, we are given a consideration of academic tenure, of the security of the professor's position. It may be answered that the Committee was directed to limit its discussions to this phase of the situation, but if so, may I register complaint as to the tactical wisdom of such a limitation. We have here a principle which is more important to us than any one of us, more important than the position of any or all professors, and for the sake of that principle I wish that the first official dealing with it by the new association might at least have had the appearance of greater disinterestedness. I should be very sorry to be misunderstood in what I have just said. I have heard that the men who have made this Report value the principle of freedom more than they do their own positions and would gladly sacrifice position to principle if need be. But my impression is that their official utterance has given an emphasis which is unfortunate and misleading in several respects.

The Report rests on the division of the activities of the college into two groups—(1) those of investigation and teaching, carried on by teachers, and (2) those of administration, which are in the hands of the trustees and president. And the question of academic freedom which the Report considers is this—Does the administration interfere with the freedom of the teachers; and if so, what can the teacher do to prevent such interference? Now I am

not disputing the reality nor the importance of this question, and I should be very sorry to be interpreted as out of sympathy with the men who have formulated and are facing it. But, perhaps because of the position in which it places me as a college president, I find myself resenting the formulation if it claims to be at all fundamental in its representation of the issue. And my complaints are (1) that the formulation is relatively superficial and (2) that it ignores more significant phases of the problem which might better have been chosen as the fighting ground for the first attack. May I try to explain?

The Report presupposes the separation of teachers on the one side and president and trustees on the other, and prepares to deal with the possibility that the latter should limit the freedom of the former. The supposed case is one in which the financial interests of the institution are trying to determine by limitation and perhaps by prescription what doctrines shall be taught in the institution. And to provide against this outrageous interference the Report recommends that the action of trustees and president with regard to *reappointments and dismissals* should be subject to some sort of check by action of members of the teaching force. But it is altogether obvious that reappointments and dismissals are not the essential features of the situation. The really important issue is that of appointments. If you suppose a president and board of trustees deliberately starting out to determine the content of instruction along the line of some selected interest, what do you think their course of action would be? I have not been a college president very long but it seems to me that if that goal were to be sought one would not travel toward it along the road which the members of this committee are proposing to barricade. It has been suggested here today that a good proportion of the teachers who have gotten into trouble with regard to their freedom have been at least "unwise." But the same observation must hold regarding the other side of the relationship. If one were, as a college president, to set about limiting academic freedom, he would be very foolish



to attempt it by the dismissal of professors who have attracted public attention by the freedom of their utterances. To do that is to invite public condemnation, to arouse public clamor and to ensure the contempt and distrust of all the men who are left upon the teaching staff. The president or trustee who does that is defeating his own purpose. And this method need not be adopted because a much more safe and adequate one is at hand, viz., that of making the right appointments to serve one's purpose. The advantages of this method become obvious as soon as one considers the conditions under which appointments are made. May I give an illustration out of my own experience? Two years ago we received a large gift for the establishment of a professorship. For the next eighteen months I was engaged in the task of searching the country for possible candidates for the appointment. With the help of friends I looked over the available men from coast to coast and from line to line. Supposing now that I had been eager to arrange that a certain type of doctrine be taught at Amherst, what better opportunity could have been found? How many men did we refuse to consider because they were too radical; how many were too conservative; how many were objectionable to this or that interest? Who knows? I know personally that no man's views were even mentioned during the inquiry, but who else knows? If we were trying to get a certain point of view taught, here is the place to do it—in the confidential inquiries and decisions concerning the possible candidates. Discrimination of this sort can be done in secret; it arouses no public discussion, it gives no basis for hostility on the part of teachers previously chosen.—And so I repeat that if this Report presupposes a sinister attack by presidents and trustees upon the freedom of academic teaching, it has ignored and neglected the line along which that attack can best be made; it has concerned itself rather with the security of the men already appointed than with the selection of new men, and the latter point is the one at which deadly work could really be done by an enemy predisposed to the doing of it.

I wish very much that this committee of the professors had dealt with the question whether or not the "point of view" of a candidate for a professorship may properly be considered at all by those who make the appointment. And if it may be considered I wish they would tell us in what respects and to what degree it is to be regarded. It is of no use to discuss infractions of academic freedom unless we know what that freedom is, and this new association would do splendid service if it would at least make a beginning of the work of formulation at this essential point. I know from personal experience that professors object to the appointment of other men because "they do not like their points of view" and I have no doubt that presidents and trustees are influenced in the same way. Are we right or wrong in this, and if wrong, what is the extent and nature of our sin?

And in like manner, the report of the committee fails, for the present at least, to give a definition of the principle so far as it relates to the *dismissal* of professors. It asks that teachers be given a share in making decisions upon such cases but does not find itself able as yet to determine the grounds on which the decisions should be made. May I say frankly that I think that clearness as to principle is far more important than the proposal of modification of college organization and procedure. The proposal itself has, I think, decided disadvantages of its own. The Association of University Professors has in its very organization set up a sort of oligarchy, separating those teachers who have achieved some prescribed measure of success from those who have not and admitting only the former to membership in the Association. And this proposal seems to me to lead still further in the same direction. Its effect would be to give power, not to the faculty as a whole, but to some smaller group of dominating men, however they might be chosen. The evil here is closely akin to that of the institution known as "head of the department." I have heard a good deal about the despotism of college presidents and trustees but I do not believe that it compares with that

of the so-called "heads" who are in charge of groups of subordinate teachers. These "heads" are not like presidents, for being professors, they are seldom deposed. They block the way of advancement of all younger men; in large measure they determine what shall be taught and how it shall be taught by their subordinates; and my impression is that in many cases their "points of view" are rather important and that conflicting "points of views" sometimes have to give way before them. Such a form of organization is, I think, essentially hostile to academic freedom and academic comity. Before our faculties take the responsibility of "checking" the activities of presidents and trustees I should like to see them secure and establish greater democracy of control in their own procedure, greater freedom from interference by one member in the activities and fortunes of others.

But the essential defect of the Report seems to me to lie in the presupposition from which it starts. It separates teachers on the one hand from trustees and presidents on the other. And its question is, "How far may the first group be free from interference from the second?" But is there not also a question, a much deeper question, with regard to the freedom of the second group? Over against the question of the freedom of the teacher I should like to put that of the freedom of both groups, of the college as a whole as an institution of learning. Apparently this Report is saying, "Those who are responsible for the financial welfare of the college may, for the sake of that, attempt to interfere with the teaching; and such interference must be prevented. But what does this mean? Does it mean that the financial agents of the college are to secure support by arousing the expectation on the part of donors that certain "interests" will be served? And is it supposed further that the teachers are to see to it that such expectations are disappointed, that the promises virtually or explicitly made are not kept? I am afraid that the Report faces a rather awkward dilemma. It plans to secure academic freedom in an institution by a procedure whose fun-

damental presupposition is that the president and trustees are not free but are the slaves of some power which has them securely in its control. If it is the belief of the professors that the acceptance of gifts carries with it the implication that certain limitations are to be imposed upon academic freedom, then there is only one honest recommendation which they can make, viz., that such gifts be not received. The suggestion that we sell our freedom and have it too is a rather greedy one and it is inevitably at war with itself.

The point just made can be stated in another way if we note that the Report of the Committee has simply accepted a traditional and popular view of the functions of trustees and president. It has assumed a separation in the organization of the college and has not really criticised the assumption. It is the same attitude which found expression in the sharp separation of professors and presidents when the Association was formed. But as against it, I protest that no machinery can make free an institution which is by presupposition half free and half enslaved. And further I insist that the freedom of the college as a unified whole is more important even than that of the professor, even though he be the one really important individual within the college.

Is not the real truth that we are facing an old dilemma with regard to freedom? "What is it," asks Epictetus, "that disturbs and terrifies the multitude? The tyrant and his guards? By no means. What is by nature free cannot be disturbed or restrained by anything but itself. Its own principles are what disturb it." And the simple fact is that the American college has been trying to be free while at the same time greedily desiring things not in its own power, but in the power of others to give. We want more money, more buildings, more equipment, larger salaries, more students, and so long as this is true we are not in the fullest sense our own masters. For the professor who says, "But those matters are the concern of the administration; let presidents and trustees do whatever truck-

ling may be necessary; I meanwhile will be free, secure in my opinions, my position, my salary"—for the professor who says that in word or deed I have nothing but the keenest contempt. I do not like the man who buys his dignity and purity at the cost of another's degradation. If the college is to be free, it must be free through and through, trustees, teachers, president, students alike, and so far as this is not true we can have only the semblance of freedom wherever it may appear to be.

I presume it is fair to say that it is because they have been going through the period of youthful growth that our colleges and universities have been in so large measure dependent on outside assistance and support. But it seems to me the time is almost at hand when many of them can cease from growing in the quantitative sense, can regard themselves as having enough of money and equipment and students, can limit their desires to the things within their own power, viz., to the giving of better instruction to the students within their walls. When that day comes, I think there will be little question about academic freedom. And I think that the teachers can help in bringing the day nearer by really wishing it to come.

I have tried in these words to express in the form of criticism my essential agreement with the Report of the Committee and with the purpose of the Association which it represents. My single complaint is that the Report does not go far enough, that it assumes as its basis a relationship within the college which is so harmful to the cause of academic freedom as to be intolerable. It may be that some such faculty "checking" of administrative action is desirable, but whether that be true or not there are more essential matters which demand our consideration. As a college president I am not content with the provision that only the other half shall be free.



## THE ACADEMIC BUDGET.

HOLLIS GODFREY, PRESIDENT OF DREXEL INSTITUTE.

Underneath discussions of content and method lies the budget, which makes practical the scholastic ideal. Once we determine an educational ideal, its accomplishment depends on a realization of the fact that salaries must be paid, equipment must be secured, grounds and buildings must be maintained, fixed charges must be met, and all the varied community activities of the small and large communities of the college world carried on by the expenditure of money. Nowhere is the determination of the stress which it is possible to lay on any division of any educational project more easily determined than by reference to the limitations of the budget. Nowhere is there possibility for more friction or for better feeling in a faculty. Too often budget making is still the mere haphazard bringing together of those disbursements which, it appears, must be met in the succeeding year. Too often no fixed educational policy lies behind the items of income and of expenditure. The paper presented here outlines certain practical methods adopted by the Drexel Institute to insure freedom from these difficulties.

Largely because of the all-pervasive nature of the budget, Drexel Institute found it necessary, at an early stage, to include problems of budget making in the studies which it has been making as regards its "Maximum Capacity for Service"—studies on which the President has already had the honor of making a preliminary report, on behalf of his colleagues, before the Association of Urban Universities. Of the underlying purposes of these studies and of the particular study mentioned here. It is sufficient to say that we define our general purpose at the institute to be the training of undergraduates in our three schools, Engineering, Domestic Science and

The relation between research studies and the purpose of the Institute.

Arts, and Secretarial, "to think rightly and work hard and to live and work co-operatively with other people;" and to say also that we desire to give them, as nearly as possible, the irreducible minimum of necessary information and the maximum of power.

**The larger duties of an academic institution.** Co-ordinate with these purposes appear the underlying beliefs in our studies of service. We believe that teaching is a great art, and that its main purpose is to transfer the vital thought—the flame of learning—from the mind of the teacher to the mind of the scholar; that every change or expenditure in a purely teaching institution should be made with one thought in mind—Does this assist or hinder the transference of this vital thought? Together with this comes the realization of our duty as trustees of a great foundation not to waste a dollar of the funds intrusted to our care, and our duty as trustees of student life not to waste an hour of the student's time.

**The three general divisions of this paper.** With this brief preliminary statement of the researches of the Institute, including the study whose results are briefly outlined here, this paper turns to the development of a budget applicable to academic needs, and to the purposes underlying the items of the budget. The entire discussion will be divided into three parts:

First: General principles underlying academic budget making.

Second: The form of the budget.

Third: Educational stresses in the budget.

#### General Principles Underlying Academic Budget Making.

**Date of opening of financial year.**

For many reasons the financial year of a college can best be opened at the beginning of the college year, September 1st, since by this means all statistics of

registration correspond to all statistics of cost. A financial year opening September 1st is, therefore, assumed in this paper.

**Factors determining the making of two budgets each year.** Having determined that the financial year and the college year shall co-incide, the problem of whether an institution shall have one or two budgets comes next. It is scarcely necessary to say here that the great problem of budget making,

next to its problems of selective distribution among departments, is to gain the greatest possible accuracy in estimating income and disbursements. When one budget only is made for the financial year, it is difficult to gain this desired accuracy, for a complete budget, passed in the spring preceeding a given year, when many sources of income can be only very approximately calculated, leaves many possibilities of errors of finance. Budget making in the form of one budget made before the beginning of the financial year is likely to produce one of two things—either disbursements seriously needed may be put aside because the income may appear too small, or expenditures are authorized which afterwards appear unwise because of the fact that expected income does not materialize.

**The two budgets.** For these reasons, the Drexel institute determined to have two budgets yearly,—a preliminary budget in May when the income was estimated on the basis of a minimum expectation of income based upon an extremely conservative or minimized view of the preceding year's income, and a final budget in December when the year's income was known to a considerable degree of accuracy. In the December budget, the income may be apportioned on the basis of a close approximation to the actual amount which will be available, an amount which has so far, proved much larger than the conservative amount estimated the preceeding May.

These two budgets have come to be known to us as the May budget and the December budget, and will be so named here.

**Income in the May budget.** The conservative estimated income of the May budget contains as known factors those which have been obtained from the college year just ending,—that is, the total known receipts of the preceding year less any possible diminution which may be foreseen, but not plus any increase. This action produces intentionally a very conservative estimate of income. The known factors of the preceding year are net income from endowment, actual tuition, and all other actual receipts from the first and second terms.

**Disbursements in the May budget.** The May budget contains as disbursements, those necessary expenses which must be contracted for the whole academic year, such as salaries, the absolutely unavoidable expenses for operating and for maintenance of property, insurance interest, and any other expenses showing in the financial statement of the preceding year on which no possible margin of saving can be at that time foreseen. This budget also contains as disbursements, those items for all departments which must be paid during September, October and November, leaving the variable expenditures for the other nine months of the financial year for consideration in the December budget. The May budget is then a tentative budget based upon a minimum expenditure and liable to any necessary revision up or down in the December budget.

**The known and estimated income factors of December.** The December Budget (so called because it goes into effect December first) is passed in November, and contains as known income the following factors,—any cash balance from the preceding year, known receipts from endowment to date, and actual tuition receipts and the like from the first term

*plus two estimated factors*; one, the estimated income from the endowment still to come, and, two, the estimated tuition receipts for the second term. By December first a large portion of the revenues for the academic year are known and that portion of them which must be estimated is provided with known factors with which to estimate the minimum. A brief discussion of our methods of estimating the two unknown factors follows:

**Method of obtaining the first estimated income factor.**

As regards the first estimated factor, the estimate covering the income from endowment, this is made up and submitted by the Treasurer in charge of the endowment funds. It consists of the expected revenues from productive properties based on the revenues of the present year compared with the revenues of past years. It is inevitably far more accurate in December of a financial year than in the May preceding, as, in the case of ordinary institutional properties, the income from any given December to the following September may be very clearly determined.

**The second estimated factor determined by those methods.**

As regards the second estimated factor, the estimated income from periodical fees,—in this specific instance the income from the second term receipts—these fees have been seldom if ever estimated in academic institutions with any precision, and the method of estimating proposed here is, therefore, given in some detail. There are three methods used for estimating college record term receipts, which are in brief outline, as follows:

**First Method:** This consists of finding the unknown quantity in the following proportion: the *actual* fees received in the first term of the preceding year are to the *actual* fees received in the second term of the preceding year as the *actual* fees received in the first term of the year under consideration are to the *estimated* fees to be received in the second term of the same year. By this method, three known factors are used in order to



obtain the estimated fourth, which is based upon the ratio of first term receipts to second term receipts.

**Second Method:** This consists of an estimate calculated on the assumption that if every pupil enrolled in September should pay in February, and to these assumed receipts the actual receipts of February of the preceding year are added, a combination of a known maximum and a known minimum is obtained. The maximum being the total enrollment for September of the present year. The minimum being the February enrollment of the preceding year. Now, if a known maximum and a known minimum are averaged, the result provides a probable mean.

**Third Method:** This consists of adding the actual receipts of the preceding year to the actual increase in fees for the first term. This would give the actual figures for a whole year, assuming that all the increases in fees came in the first term, and allotting no increase in fees to the second term. This gives a total income calculated from the minimum increased fees for the year. If the known income of the first term and the estimated endowment receipts of the year are subtracted from the sum thus obtained, the result gives a conservative estimate of the receipts for the second term, provided there has been no lessening in the total increase in first term receipts.

It is, of course, evident that a decrease in receipts means subtraction in the processes indicated, instead of addition.

Each of the methods given above yields a probable estimate. By averaging the results of the three, however, a figure may be obtained representing a particularly good average of the estimated second term receipts. It should be noted that by this method the semester fees received at the Drexel Institute have been estimated within five per cent of the second term receipts—which makes the estimate of total receipts come

The result of  
the three meth-  
ods averaged.

within two per cent,—while in every case the receipts actually taken in have been above the estimate, as they should be, with any conservative estimating of income.

**Review of the advantages of dividing the budget into two parts.**

Reviewing the advantages of dividing the budget into two parts as outlined above, the following may be said:

First: The income made the basis of all plans is made up largely of a known part and to a much less extent of an estimated part which is calculated from a known base.

Second: That as a result of the more accurate determination of income, all variable expenditures are authorized on the basis of a far more accurately determined income.

Third: That the educational and economic changes in a college occurring in seven months make possible a far wiser estimate of permanent needs in November than in the preceding May.

In short, this method of budgeting gives the officer who prepares the budget conservatism in his outlook and increased accuracy in the making of decisions as regards educational policy.

**Summer construction as a disadvantage.**

The first disadvantage is more apparent than real, once a college determines to live within its income and to make the close of its financial year August 31st. As regards the general problem of financing summer construction, let me say that it is our policy to let each financial year take care of its own burden, and to add only such construction and equipment as we can pay for in a given year.

**The two disadvantages.**

The only disadvantages in this plan which have been so far presented are the limitation of work during the summer vacation and the preference of department heads to buy their equipment for an entire academic year at one time.

The amount available for summer construction is known.

In May, when the budget for a succeeding year is made, the amount of money which will be left from the expenditures of the current year and which is available for summer construction is very definitely known. It is, to all intents and purposes that amount which is left over beyond operating and fixed expenses. If the amount on hand is sufficient to do the required work, the handling of the matter becomes easy—it is merely a matter of transferring any existing balances to the construction account and of seeing that all bills are in and charged to the August accounts—so making all construction account chargeable to the present year.

The financial burden of the present should be placed on the present year.

If there is not enough money ahead to do the required work, it is usually the business of the President to see that it is provided. My plea here is simply that the president, if funds must be obtained for the purpose, should get them ahead, instead of behind time, and that, instead of constructing or equipping in the hope of meeting a deficit, all summer construction for a current year be financed in that year instead of placing the financial burden on the succeeding year.

Ordering for only a part of the year as a disadvantage.

As regards the plans of department heads, I can only speak for our own faculty—but, in our own case, the financial administration does everything that the income will allow to meet the needs of the department heads—while the department heads—primarily by dividing their needs into two groups, those things needed in September, October and November, and those things needed for the other nine months—do all they can to enable us to live within our income.

Reviewing the possible disadvantages.

Reviewing the discussion of possible disadvantages in this method, it will be noted that the theory of the presentation of two budgets assumes besides the prin-

ciples already stated, one other concept—one other principle—that the most easily controllable general item of expenditure is that for equipment and construction. In teaching, bricks and mortar are secondary to brains—and the come and go of the budget should be placed in the secondary items. Salaries must be fixed for the year; most of the expenditures for maintenance and operation permit of but small economy; and fixed expenses are fixed; but equipment and construction are capable of expansion and contraction.

---

#### The Form of the Budget.

**The Importance of budget form.**

Next to the proper division of the budget comes the extremely important matter of the form of its presentation. A matter which must be considered in relation to the Board by which its items are approved. The average Board of Trustees is a group of very busy persons. The length of Board meetings is short at best, yet the Board should understand every vital point about a given budget. If they are to grasp the vital points, those which are not vital must be eliminated. Elimination of unnecessary detail and emphasis on the necessary points is therefore essential to proper presentation. It should be constantly remembered that not only is the material of which the budget is comprised important, but also that great care should be taken in the arrangement of this material, keeping constantly in mind the fact that, unless this material is clearly and concisely indexed and stated, a correct perspective cannot be gained, proper stresses cannot be made and wrong emphasis necessarily results. In working out a budget for primary presentation to a Board which must pass upon it, there are certain well defined essentials which must appear.

The index sheet precedes all else. Following this in order comes:

First: Summary of the known receipts, briefly and clearly stated.

Second: Summary of the estimated receipts with a note showing the methods of estimation.

Third: Summary of the known expenses.

Fourth: Summary of estimated expenses.

Fifth: Detail sheets expanding the summaries to any desired point.

The arrangement of summary and detail sheets illustrates the point already made of using some logical means to stress important points. Every summary sheet should lead back to detail sheets. To take a single example in this line, the following paragraphs outline the details which support the third and fourth summarized sheets of the budget,—known and estimated expenses. Under the head of salaries, the largest expenditure is covered. In order of expenditures, the second head is material for operating; third comes maintenance of property; fourth, fixed expenses. These summary heads are capable of further subdivisions:

Under the first head—salaries, falls  
**The first head.** salaries of the administrative force, the day and evening teaching force, laboratory, shop and administrative assistants, engineers and janitors.

Under the second head—material  
**The second head.** for operating—comes such general expenditures as supplies, printing and stationery, advertising, disability insurance, heat and light, lectures and entertainments and general incidentals.

Under the third head—maintenance  
**The third head** of property—falls buildings, library equipment and furniture, also office furniture and equipment and school apparatus and appliances.



**The fourth head.** Under the fourth head—fixed expense—come certain necessary and comparatively unchanging items such as insurance, interest, safe rent and water rent.

**Actionable and Explanatory parts of the budget.** It may be noted that in the case of a budget arranged as outlined here, two distinct parts appear, each with their special function. The first part of the budget contains those matters which must be passed by the Board—the index sheet, the summary sheets and the subsequent detail sheets. The second part of the budget contains explanatory material which shows such historical relations as indicate the general financial trend of the past and show material to be used in deciding the future financial policy of the institution.

**Detailed and Explanatory sheets second part of the budget.** Turning in detail to the second or explanatory part of the budget, it should be noted that the material contained therein is mainly comparative. As already noted, this part of the budget forms a basis for future action, but is not a subject for definite action by a Board. These explanatory sheets, which make up the second part of the budget, are sheets whose importance should, however, be emphasized. They are:

First: Summary of increases of appropriation in the present year over disbursements of the past.

Second: Statement of the comparative totals of past year and present year.

Third: A comparative statement showing a general classification of expense of the years preceding.

**The first explanatory sheet.** An analysis of the first sheet giving increases of appropriation in the present year over the disbursements of the past year, will indicate (as a part of the systematic financial policy of the institution) just what financial opportunities for further development are possible.

**The second explanatory sheet.**

The second explanatory sheet groups the statements of the comparative of past year and present year under the four summarized headings already outlined:

Salaries, past disbursements and present appropriations.

Material for operating, past disbursements, present appropriations.

Maintenance of property, past disbursements, present appropriations.

Fixed expenses, past disbursements, present appropriations.

An analysis of these comparative totals shows immediately if any disproportionate increase or decrease has been made in any of the four departments which cannot be fully justified.

**The third explanatory sheet.**

How many years should be shown in the analysis given on the third sheet containing a comparative statement showing a general classification of ex-

penses of the years preceding, it is quite impossible to say. In one institution economic and educational changes have come so rapidly that the results of two years give all that are of value. In another, each of twenty-five years may give valuable data to effect future decisions. Each case must be decided on its own merits, but two principles can always be kept in mind. Decisions, to be valuable, must always be made on the basis of selective data. And that means that only those data are valuable which serve as a clue to future policy. History's great value is as a guide to the decisions of the present and of the future.

#### Educational Stresses in the Budget.

**The budget as a means of selective development.**

Passing now from the material content and form of arrangement to the educational possibilities underlying the budget, it should be emphasized, that until the budget is recognized as a means for

the selective development of educational ideals the working powers of any educational institution has not been completely utilized.

**Budget as a means by which a systematic financial policy is made possible.**

In the items for salaries and pensions, for example, a proper budget makes possible decent salaries for the staff, makes possible the determination of an academic wage which can be and is (in the case of the Drexel Institute) based on carefully worked out study of the necessities of an academic life. Only through systematic budgeting together with the analytical material which accompanies it, can such a systematic financial policy be attained as will make it possible to work out a fair plan of systematic advancement in salaries and to ascertain definitely what services must be given to make present or advanced salaries possible with the income available. In the same way, a proper budget forms the basis upon which a systematic pension plan may be arranged. In the proper balancing of construction and equipment lies justice for each department and the recognition of the educational value of a scrap heap. In the items for maintenance of property and of educational supplies proper budgeting makes for comfortable working conditions for the teaching force and for sufficient supplies for effective teaching.

The few examples given above indicate briefly some of the possibilities existing among the major divisions of the budget. Time forbids the discussion of more than two more, the amount devoted to student activities and faculty activities.

**Budget possibilities in connection with student development.**

It should be remembered, however, that while we make a part of our aim to enable the individual to think rightly and work hard, we are also endeavoring to make him understand the possibilities of living and working co-operatively with other people. To make the student a social being

in a community world, nothing is more vital than a study of the different activities of student life.

**Emphasis on fundamental and specific development.**

We cannot get away from the fact that both the educated man and woman must have both fundamental and specific education, and that no small part of fundamental education consists in a sympathy with and an appreciation of music, letters, art and the healthy sports of the out-of-door world, lectures by powerful men and women, the musical activities of the glee club, the orchestra and the mandolin and guitar club, the art interests of the college, the Men's Union and Women's Union where men and women may settle, as youth has always settled, the problems of life and of the state, and the athletic and outdoor activities. The emphasis placed upon each of these items by the budget appropriations devoted to their use reflects the spiritual significance of the college.

**Value of the contingent fund to the vitality of teaching.**

Before closing, one word should be said regarding one item of the budget which we believe has no slight effect upon the vitality of our teaching—that item which has to do with the broadening and vitalizing of the faculty. With our contingent, we intend each year to send a third of our faculty away to see the best work done elsewhere and to bring it back to us, giving each faculty member their railroad fares, pullmans, and six dollars a day for each day away, before they start. As we have provided the Men's Union and the Women's Union, so we provide the Men's Faculty Club and the Women's Faculty Club. As we believe in the education of the student, so we believe in the education of the faculty and pay the first fee of any member of the staff who wishes to take graduate work at the University of Pennsylvania or at Columbia.

**As regards hospitality.**

And, in doing all this, we try not to neglect one other art—the art of hospitality. For our own sakes, we need the

pleasant mingling with our guests. For the sake of educational advance, we are glad to play our part in the forward movement of our great art of teaching.

From all these standpoints it appears to us that the budget is obviously a vital factor in education, and one whose true value has been realized but lately. As in the make-up of every finished product, it is absolutely necessary that much attention be given to the selection of the raw material, so, in the making of our educational product, the raw material must not be overlooked. In the budget, the raw material which we are called upon to consider, is composed of a number of elements—those essentials already mentioned, the known receipts, the estimated receipts, the known expenses, the estimated expenses, whose effective use depends largely upon an understanding of the principles involved in their use. These elements of the budget, like raw materials are worked over until they assume the form of parts—the index, the summary, the detail and the explanatory sheets, which when assembled produce the budget, an effective mechanism by which proper educational stresses can be brought about and coherent policies of educational advances obtained.

A paper like this is inevitably tentative. The experience related here is of but two years duration, one of thirty-six studies in our search for the maximum capacity for service, and we are decidedly in the learning stage, glad to receive constructive criticism from anyone who can give it. But in any case, this much can be said:

With all these elements properly brought together and properly translated, the budget has proved to us a valuable aid in making effective the purpose of the Institute, to waste no dollar of the endowment or hour of the student's time, and to transfer the vital thought.



